DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 868 CS 500 235

AUTHOR Goldhaber, Gerald M.
TITLE Communication and Student Unrest: A Report to the President of the University of New Mexico; Part I: Student-Administration Channels, Student Faculty Channels.
PUB DATE Jan 71
NOTE 57p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; College Administration; *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Dissent; Information Dissemination; Interaction Process Analysis; Mass Media; Organizational Climate; Power Structure; *Student College Relationship; *Student Teacher Relationship

ABSTRACT

This initial segment of a three-part study (Communication and Student Unrest) is an examination of the various communication channels--informal and formal, vertical and horizontal--which exist for student-administration and student-faculty interaction. Student-administration and student-faculty communication channels are discussed separately, and each section includes a general description of how the varied channels function, an evaluation of selected channels, and recommendations for improving channel effectiveness based on the researcher's evaluations. Section 1 contains functional analyses of the University of New Mexico's "Open Door Policy," secretarial channels, the president's weekly "rap" session in the student union, and KUMN radio's interview show. Section 2 focuses on student-faculty channels and discusses instructional communication in depth. It examines classroom channels such as videotaped instruction, teaching assistants, course and instructor evaluation, faculty office hours, committee meetings, and student curriculum inputs. The author stresses the need for the establishment of an open and permissive interaction climate if effective and efficient communication is to occur. (See related document CS 500 236.) (LG)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 075868

COMMUNICATION AND STUDENT UNREST:

A REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

by

GERALD M. GOLDHABER, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Organizational Communication
Department of Speech
University of New Mexico

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gerald M. Goldhaber

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

January, 1971

PART I: STUDENT-ADMINISTRATION CHANNELS

STUDENT FACULTY CHANNELS

This is a private printing of 300 copies, limited to private circulation. For confidential use only. Not for circulation, distribution or publication. All rights in this work are the property of the author, Gerald M. Goldhaber, Department of Speech, University of New Mexico.

CS 500 235

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is not to analyze the causes of student unrest (see Scranton and Linowitz Reports, 1970, for this) but to investigate the communication implications for unrest. Specifically, the various channels of communication (informal and formal, vertical and horizontal) which operate on the campus of the University of New Mexico will be described and evaluated to assess the impact of inefficient or inoperative channels upon student unrest. Recommendations to either alter or close existing channels or implement new channels will be suggested.

The study will be divided into three parts:

I. Part I will examine student-faculty and student-administration channels;

II. Part II will examine faculty-administration and university-public channels;

III. Part III will examine student, faculty and administration channels individually.

Part II will be released on or about March 1, 1971;
Part III will be released on or about June 1, 1971.

Copies of this or any future part of the report may be obtained by writing directly to the author.

A special note of sincere gratitutde is made to Richard Dillender and Karen Evans whose assistance in the collection and analysis of the data was invaluable.

I wish to briefly thank the University of New Mexico administration for opening all of the necessary doors which made this research possible, the several dozen faculty members and several hundred students who were either interviewed or surveyed in writing, and to all of the above sources for their anticipated cooperation in the future until Parts II and III of this report are completed.

A final note of sincere gratitude is expressed to May Granaas who typed and proofread this manuscript and is one secretary who practices supportive human communication.

Rationale

Violence and disruption plagued hundreds of colleges and universities during the 1960's. The Linowitz committee (1970) on campus tensions has reported that "in the particularly turbulent year 1968-69, an estimated 145, or 6.2 percent, of the nation's 2,300 colleges and universities experienced incidents of violent protest; an additional estimated 379, or 16.2 percent, experienced nonviolent but disruptive protest." In the aftermath of such violence and disruption, local, state and national commissions have been formed to study the causes of campus unrest; yet, few colleges and universities appear to be engaged in active introspection. College and University Business (1963) has concluded that "colleges and universities remain today among the least studied institutions in America. Few colleges study themselves: No more than 300 have offices of institutional research. Few external studies are made." Ferrel Heady, President of the University of New Mexico, has stated that "academic administration in American colleges and universities has never been the subject of systematic and sustained study. Students of large-scale organizations, even though they are usually faculty members in institutions of higher learning, have preferred to analyze other organizational types."

Communication breakdowns are typical of the large complex organization; the university has not escaped this phenomenon. In the last decade failures to communicate have often been cited as cause for unrest on several campuses; these failures result in recommendations from all levels to "open up the channels" and begin "meaningful dialogue." At the 1965 conference of the American Council of Education, Lipscomb stated, "Permanent channels of communication should be established. . . . These channels should be designed to cater to mass modes of student expression, be it through student newspapers, popularly elected student government (often, actually, not so popular), or peaceful demonstrations (often more popular). The channels may be formal, as with student votes on administrative and faculty policy committees or frequent news releases from the president's office published in the student newspaper; or informal, as with occasional commingling of top administrators with students over coffee or meals. The air about these channels should be one of consent and permissiveness, an encouragement to the free flow of ideas, regardless of their nature, a condition so essential to our traditional concept of academic freedom." Williamson and Cowan (1966) advise that students "seek to enter into significant dialogue with administration and faculty members about these vital problems and issues of freedom. They wish to be free to examine proposed alternative solutions to social dilemmas and to advocate answers to important and seductive forms and to challenge advocates of any position." Farnsworth (1966) has warned that a lack of interpersonal communication between students and those who mean much to them (e.g. faculty), may result in a condition of frustration ripe for exploitation by those who would seek to incite disruption and riot on a campus. He states, "in such instances it is not difficult for clever would-be leaders to exploit the temporary discontent for their own purposes. The best

defense of a college in such a situation is the good sense of the great majority of students. As with demagogues generally, they cannot tolerate being understood by large numbers of people."

It would appear that the advice of those cited above is starting to be heeded (especially by those institutes involved in serious disruption during the spring of 1970). FYI (Sept. 18, 1970) has reported that "although administrators have sought to prepare themselves to deal with violence and widespread campus disorders with firm policies and action plans, equal emphasis has been devoted to the development of means of averting wholesale dissent. The key word in such efforts is: Communication. Recognizing the lack of communication has often been a factor in escalating campus unrest, many universities have taken steps to fill the gap." These "steps" include information centers at the University of Kansas, Ohio University, University of Michigan, Pennsylvania State University, rumor switchboards at University of California at Santa Barbara; opinion polls at Florida State University and Ohio University; retreats at the University of New Mexico; and programs to improve communication between the university and the public at Kansas State University, the University of Arkansas, the University of South Carolina and the University of Kansas.

The importance of institutes of higher education continuing (or starting) programs to improve communication among the members of the academic community is emphasized by the Scranton Report (1970) on Campus Unrest, "first, much good can be done through more understanding and better understanding . . . understanding does not obliterate differences. But understanding can reduce incidents and clashes and the risks of greater distrust and violence." The Linowitz Report further underscores the importance of communication, "all four constituent groups (students, faculty, administration and trustees) cite inadequate communication as a major cause of tension . . . every attempt must be made to establish effective communications, so that policy questions and grievances can be aired by the campus community."

In summary, the rationale for conducting the following study rests upon the following assumptions:

1. Student unrest is symptomatic of several hundred colleges and universities;
2. Colleges and universities do not make it a habit of studying themselves from an organization theory standpoint;
3. Breakdowns in communication are often cited as causal factors of student unrest;
4. Effective communication among all members of the academic community will hasten greater understanding of the issues and the personalities; increased understanding will result in increased trust; increased trust will reduce the conditions for unrest which exist on hundreds of campuses.

Student-Administration Channels

The Linowitz Report cited "the most prevalent of the specific issues that had violent protests: (1) instituting special educational programs for disadvantaged or minority groups, (2) allowing greater student participation on committees, (3) changing institutional disciplinary practices, (4) challenging apparent administrative indifference or inaction to grievances, and (5)--an off-campus issue--challenging alleged administrative indifference to local community problems." (Numbers 2, 4 and 5 relate directly to communication channels between the administration and the students.) The report went on to recommend, "Presidents and other administrators have an especially urgent responsibility to ensure that avenues of communication are open. Some presidents are cut off by overconscientious aides or secretaries; others are seldom seen on campus and never talk with students and seldom with faculty. How to keep the channels open will present a different problem on every campus. Nevertheless, it should always be possible for a student, faculty member, trustee, or layman who has a message to get through to the president. Accessibility, moreover, is not the whole answer. Presidents and other administrators must take positive steps to explain their plans and policies to the appropriate constituencies, through such devices as newsletters, annual reports, town meetings, or position papers on particular issues. They must also provide students, faculty, and others with information sufficiently in advance to enable them to make contributions to decisions. To communicate effectively administrators must be open and candid in giving reasons for decisions and actions. There are instances when the release of information would needlessly injure individuals. But the withholding of information on such occasions will be better understood and accepted if, at all other times, communication is candid. Here, also, continuing efforts are as important as those during crisis. Administrators should meet frequently with faculty and student groups, not only to listen but also to make known their thinking on basic issues."

Too often administrators spend most of their communication time talking to other administrators. Gray (1965) has reported that "there are deans who habitually converse only with heads of departments and there are college presidents who let weeks, even months, pass without leisurely and intimate talks to students and junior faculty." Katz and Sanford (1966) advise "those who are in especially strategic positions to devote an important part of their time to detailed listening to what students have to say . . . In our many contacts with different institutions during the past years we have been amazed at how little information about students is in the possession of many administrators and faculty members." Wingfield (1970) recommends that the "university administration should maintain communications with its entire student body, and be particularly patient with those students who have not developed finesse and skill in negotiating legitimate needs." Finally, the Scranton Report concluded that "above all, the administrator must keep open every possible channel of talk with students . . . he must have an open mind, for much that students say is valuable; he must have a cryptographer's mind, for much that they say comes in code words and postures."

I. Description of Existing Channels at the University of New Mexico

A. Open-door Policy

A legitimate open-door policy allows a visitor entrance to the administrator's office at any time the "boss" is alone in the office and not on the telephone. This policy negates the necessity of having an appointment before entrance can be gained; the policy necessitates secretarial cooperation.

At the University of New Mexico, the President, four Vice-Presidents, and five academic deans claim to have an open-door policy. Directors, department heads and other administrators were not surveyed on this question. The major reason given by the two Vice-Presidents and four academic deans for not having an effective open-door policy was that appointments and meetings accounted for most of their time spent in the office. This channel was evaluated for effectiveness, and the results are reported in the next section of the report.

B. Secretarial Channels

Since most administrators at the University of New Mexico have at least one secretary (several have two or more), and since students usually report through a secretary to an administrator, secretaries were investigated as a separate channel of communication between students and administrators.

The researcher recognizes that a legitimate job function of the secretary may be to protect the administrator from a deluge of unnecessary visitors who consume his precious time. Therefore, the label "buffer" will be applied whenever a secretary is performing this legitimate job function. However, when the secretary becomes too overprotective of the administrator she is serving, when she continually rebuffs student visitors, when she addresses them bluntly or in a condescending manner, when she makes it almost impossible for the student to gain entrance to the administrator, etc., etc., she has now become a "barrier" to communication. Spurred by several dozen student comments related to the latter behavior, this researcher decided to investigate the secretaries to the major administrators on campus. The general question asked here was: When does a secretary cease behaving as a "buffer" and start behaving as a "barrier"? An example of the former behavior may be a secretary's referral of a student from a dean to an assistant dean (because the assistant dean may be the expert in the field of the student's question); the manner of the referral, the tone of voice, the facial expression, and other nonverbal cues are quite important in performing this task. An example of the latter behavior may be the same behavior as described above except that the secretary knows that it is the dean and NOT the assistant dean who can best answer the student's question. (She may believe that the dean is too busy in the office to be "disturbed" by the student.)

I. B. Secretarial Channels (cont'd)

Two hundred students were surveyed in an attempt to locate the secretaries who best resembled the behaviors referred to above as "barriers." The nature and frequency of their complaints are tallied, and the results are presented in the next section of the report.

C. President's Bi-weekly "Rap" Session in the Student Union

President Heady, at the request of student government, has been meeting bi-weekly in the student union lounge area with a small number of students from the University of New Mexico. The intent of the "rap" session is to promote better communication between the President and the student body, in an informal setting. The sessions are intended to last for one hour (2-3 P.M. on Mondays) but sometimes are longer. The format is informal with no structured agenda; the President answers questions posed to him by students. The lounge area is furnished with comfortable chairs; coffee is available during the session. Advance publicity is limited to a sign posted outside the lounge area; the intent is to limit the number of students to a size where effective informal communication is possible. Approximately 50-60 students per session have been attending. This researcher has been present at all of the sessions in an attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of this channel. Participating students were interviewed on the spot; the results of this evaluation are presented in the next section of the report.

D. KUNM Interview Show

KUNM, the student radio station of the University of New Mexico, has begun a new radio show which interviews key administrators and faculty on issues of current importance to the university (e.g., defense spending, university governance). The format allows for interview, discussion, and telephone questions to be answered. At the time of this writing, only two shows have been broadcast; a brief evaluation of their effectiveness will be presented in the next section.

E. President's Special Advisory Council

This committee is composed of six students, six faculty, four administrators and two alumni. It is a formal channel which meets monthly or at the call of the President in order to advise the President on issues relevant to the university. At the time of this writing this committee has held two meetings this year. An executive advisory committee, composed of the two student body presidents, the chairman of the faculty policy committee, the Vice-President for Student Affairs, and the President, meet at the call of the President. (This committee is a sub-committee of the entire advisory council and meets during emergencies when the

I. E. President's Special Advisory Council (cont'd)

entire advisory council cannot be called into session.) This channel and the remaining student-administration channels were not evaluated.

F. Weekly Student Government Meeting with the President

President Heady meets weekly with the two student body presidents, the editor of the Lobo (student newspaper), and the station manager of KUNM (student radio station). This meeting is intended to be an informal exchange of information and attitudes about university issues; the location of the meeting varies between the President's and student government's offices (sometimes it's a luncheon meeting). Recently these meetings have been bi-weekly instead of weekly.

G. Undergraduate and Graduate Courses Taught by Administrators

The President, all six Vice-Presidents, all nine Deans and certain other administrators have academic rank in addition to their administrative positions. As a result, several of them currently teach courses to either undergraduates or graduates (e.g. V.P. for Research teaches a music course; V.P. for Student Affairs teaches an undergraduate seminar in student government; Director of University College teaches a business law class, etc.) All of the administrators who now teach reported to this researcher that they enjoyed this activity, that it definitely was a means for them to maintain active communication with students, that they (for the most part) wished that they had more time for teaching.

H. Committee Meetings

This channel refers to all committees which have students and administrators on them (some may also have faculty). Included here are student committees (e.g. Student Affairs Committee, Speakers Committee, etc.), faculty committees (e.g. Campus Planning Committee, Entrance and Credits Committee, etc.), Ad Hoc Committees (e.g. University Governance Committee, etc.), Miscellaneous Committees (e.g. Student Union Board). Most of these committees meet weekly for an average of about 1-3 hours per meeting. Since this channel obviously overlaps faculty-student communication, its evaluation will be reported under that section of the report.

I. D. H. Lawrence Ranch Conferences

In 1968 two conferences were held at the D. H . Lawrence Ranch in Taos, New Mexico. Participating in the conferences were approximately 70 people (students, faculty, administrators, community leaders). Since the major purpose of the conferences was to further communication between the university and the local community, this channel will be fully described and evaluated in Part II (University-Public Channels).

I. J. Miscellaneous Channels

Written channels such as memos, letters, bulletin boards are utilized in certain departments or schools (e.g. the Law School uses a bulletin board to communicate important information quickly). Occasionally, retreats or off-campus conferences for individual issues are scheduled (e.g. University Governance Committee is sponsoring a conference for students, administrators, faculty and alumni to discuss student grievances; the administration has recently sponsored a retreat to discuss university enrollments.) Of course, no study of communication channels would be complete without at least mentioning the "grapevine," often the quickest (and least accurate) channel utilized in a complex organization.

II. Evaluation of Selected Student-Administration Channels

A. Open-Door Policy

One possible test of the effectiveness of an open-door policy is the number of people admitted to see the administrator. The calendars of the President and the six Vice-Presidents were examined during the period of time between September 14-October 14, 1970 to tally the number of student, faculty, administration, staff and other appointments scheduled for these seven administrators. In addition, during the week of October 19-23, 1970 their secretaries tallied the number of drop-ins (visitors without appointments) and phone calls by category (student, faculty, etc.). Information about appointments during the crisis month of May, 1970 was also ascertained for comparative purposes.

Table 1 summarizes the number of appointments scheduled by the top seven administrators during the months of May and September-October, 1970; the data are reported by category (student, etc.).

Table 1

Number of Appointments Scheduled During May and Sept-Oct., 1970

Administrator	Students		Faculty		Adminis.		Staff		Other		TOTALS	
	May	Sept.	May	Sept.	May	Sept.	May	Sept.	May	Sept.	May	Sept.
President	11	10	7	7	20	17	6	0	6	13	50	47
V.P. Academic Affairs	4	3	28	37	26	112	1	0	6	5	65	157
V.P. Student Affairs	27	38	6	3	2	7	21	52	7	10	63	110
V.P. Finance	0	0	4	6	24	21	3	18	3	6	34	51
V.P. Admin. and Develop.	9	4	10	0	5	66	14	2	7	2	45	74
V.P. Research	3	7	12	8	21	25	0	8	7	2	43	50
V.P. Health Sciences	3	6	19	27	6	16	0	0	6	15	34	64
TOTALS	57	68	86	88	104	264	45	80	42	53	334	553

It is apparent from Table 1 that during the period between September 14 and October 14, 1970, the top administration, with two exceptions, saw more administrators than anybody else. The two exceptions are the Vice-President for Student Affairs (who saw more students and staff than administrators) and the Vice-President for Health Sciences (who saw more faculty than administrators). During the month of May, 1970 the same pattern was followed with appointments except for the Vice-President for Academic Affairs who saw two more faculty than administrators. The totals of Table 1 indicate that the top seven administrators had appointments (between Sept. 14-Oct. 14, 1970) with 68 students, 88 faculty, 264 administraros, 80 staff and 53 other people (visitors, etc.), for a total of 553 appointments. During the month of May, 1970 they saw 57 students, 86 faculty, 104 administrators, 45 staff and 42 other people, for a total of 334 appointments. The following conclusions may be drawn from the data in Table 1:

1. Between Sept. 14-Oct. 14, 1970 almost 1/2 of the appointments scheduled by the top administration of UNM were with other administrators;

2. During May, 1970 almost 1/3 of the appointments scheduled by the top administration of UNM were with other administrators;

3. Between Sept. 14-Oct. 14, 1970 top administrators saw four administrators for every student and three administrators for every faculty member (during scheduled appointments);

4. During May, 1970 top administrators scheduled appointments with two administrators for every student and five administrators for every four faculty members (during scheduled appointments);

5. During the non-crisis period (between Sept. 14-Oct. 14, 1970) administrators talked to each other more than during the crisis period (May, 1970).

The inference might be drawn from the last conclusion that during a crisis, administrators feel the necessity to talk more to students, faculty, etc. than during a non-crisis period. Of course, other interpretations of the data are possible, but the importance of continued communication during non-crisis periods should not be overlooked as a possible buffer to unrest during crisis periods.

In addition to tallying the number of scheduled appointments, an attempt was made to tally the number of drop-ins (non appointment visitors) and phone calls received by the top seven administrators. Data for this tally were obtained for the week of October 19-23, 1970; the President's secretary also provided an estimate of the number of drop-ins seen by the President during the crisis week of May 7-15, 1970. Crisis week data for the other top administrators were unavailable. Table 2 summarizes this data.

Table 2

Number of Drop-ins (D) and Phone Calls (P) Received During Week (Oct. 19-23, 1970)

Administrator	Students		Faculty		Admin.		Staff		Other		Totals	
	D[a]	P	D	P	D	P	D	P	D	P	D	P
President	1[b]	1	0	0	4	10	0	1	0	10	5	22[c]
V.P. Academic Affairs	2[d]	3	2	7	6	30	4	4	1	10	15	54
V.P. Student Affairs	14[e]	19	0	4	8	17	8	11	1	8	31	59
V.P. Finance	f	0	0	6	0	0	0	13	0	23	0	42
V.P. Adminis. and Develop.	0[g]	1	0	1	1	10	0	1	0	1	1	14
V.P. Research	0[h]	1	5	4	3	1	1	2	0	0	9	8[i]
V.P. Health Sciences	1[j]	0	29	48	10	6	0	0	26	45	66	99[k]
TOTALS	18	25	36	70	32	74	13	32	28	97	127	298

a - D-# drop-ins (non-appointment visitors); P=# phone calls (people who actually spoke to the administrator).

b - Secretary estimates that 5 student drop-ins/month see the President; She also estimated that approximately 100 student drop-ins saw him during the crisis period of May, 1970.

c - Secretary also handled 28 phone calls herself (making referrals, etc.)

d - Secretary estimates that 8-12 student drop-ins/month see the V.P.

e - Secretary estimates that 12 student drop-ins/month see the V.P.

f - Secretary estimates that 3-4 student drop-ins/month see the V.P. (She did not record the number of drop-ins during the week Oct. 19-23)

g - Secretary estimates that 12 student drop-ins/month see the V.P.

h - Secretary estimates that 3-4 student drop-ins/month see the V.P. in his role as V.P. (he also is Dean of the Graduate School and a Professor of Anthropology); the above data reflect the dates Oct. 19-21, 1970; the secretary was sick the other two days.

i - Secretary handled 5 other calls herself (referrals, etc.).

j - Secretary estimates that 10-15 student drop-ins/month see the V.P.

k - Secretary handled 148 other calls herself (mostly business calls).

Table 2's data indicate that during the week of October 19-23, 1970 the top seven administrators of UNM saw a total of 127 visitors without appointments (18 students, 36 faculty, 32 administrators, 13 staff and 28 other people). In addition, these same administrators spoke with 298 people on the telephone (25 students, 70 faculty, 74 administrators, 32 staff and 97 other people). Students accounted for one out of seven drop-ins (V.P. for Student Affairs accounted for 78% of these) and one out of twelve telephone calls (V.P. for Student Affairs accounted for 76% of these). It is apparent that most of the top seven administrators do not receive many student drop-ins or telephone calls; the exception is the Vice-President for Student Affairs, whose job is to interact primarily with students. An interesting finding revealed in Table 2 is that in only <u>one</u> case (V.P. for Student Affairs) did the secretary's monthly estimate of student drop-ins approach or exceed the actual tabulation for this week. (Of course, sampling error could account for this, i.e. this may have been an off-week for student drop-ins.) The following conclusions may be drawn from the data in Table 2:

1. During the week October 19-23, 1970 the top seven administrators at UNM saw one student for every seven drop-ins, and spoke to one student for every twelve telephone calls;
2. The Vice-President for Student Affairs (whose job is to interact with students) accounted for 78% of the student drop-ins and 76% of the student telephone calls;
3. Administrators saw twice as many administrator drop-ins and spoke on the telephone with three times as many administrators as they did with students (during the week October 19-23, 1970);
4. Secretarial estimates of student drop-ins/month only approached or exceeded actual tabulations in one case (V.P. for Student Affairs).

It appears from the data in Table 1 and Table 2 that the open-door policy at the University of New Mexico (as it applied to the top seven administrators) is <u>not</u> attracting many students. Students do not frequently schedule appointments, drop-in or telephone the President and his six Vice-Presidents; the greatest communication through this channel appears to exist between the students and the Vice-President for Student Affairs. As mentioned above, the nature of his job may account for this behavior. Reasons for the apparent weakness of this channel of communication (as it now exists) may be varied: students may not know about the open-door policy; students may know but not have the courage or desire to take advantage of this policy; administrators may not wish to communicate this policy to students; secretaries may act as barriers to communication between the students and the administration; etc., etc. It is the last of these speculated reasons for the apparent ineffectiveness of the open-door policy which will now be evaluated.

II. Evaluation of Selected Student-Administration Channels

B. Secretarial Channels

There are 350 secretaries and clerical employees at the University of New Mexico (according to the Personnel Department of the University). Table 3 presents a breakdown of these employees by job title.

Table 3

Job Title and Number of Secretarial and Clerical Employees

Job Title	Number of Incumbents
Executive Secretaries to President and Vice-Presidents	7
Administrative Secretaries to Deans and Directors	43
Department Secretaries to Dept. Chairmen and Managers	85
Staff Secretaries	117
Clerk-Typists	43
Clerk-Stenos	23
Stenographers	32
Total	350

Since students must usually report through a secretary to an administrator, an attempt was made to find out if certain secretaries' behavior(s) were acting as barriers to communication between the students and the administrators. Two hundred students were selected (by stratefied random sampling techniques) from the student directory of the University of New Mexico. A brief questionnaire was mailed to them on October 1, 1970; one telephone call was made to each potential respondent who had failed to return the questionnaire after two weeks. Final returns totalled 108 questionnaires. Table 4 presents the questionnaire with the frequency of responses for each item.

Table 4

Secretarial Questionnaire and Responses

1. How many University secretaries did you speak with last week?
   None-19 One-73 Two-11 Three-2 More-0 Don't Remember-3

(If you answered "none" or "Don't remember," please do not continue.)

*2. How many minutes (approximately) did each interaction take?
   Under Five-75 Five-Ten-10 Ten-Fifteen-7 Over Fifteen-3
   Don't Remember-6

3. How would you best describe this experience? (these experiences?)
   Positive-39 Negative-57 Don't Remember-5

*Responses to questions 2-3 were based upon the 86 respondents who indicated in question 1 that they spoke with at least one secretary (101 interactions were actually involved, i.e. some had spoken to more than one secretary).

If you answered question 3 "positive," please answer number 4 and then stop; if you answered question 3 "Don't remember," please stop now; if you answered question 3 "negative," please skip question 4 but answer all the rest of the questions.

4. What office was the secretary located in when you spoke to her?
   (Please specify)

New Mexico Union-4	Zimmerman Library-3	College of Educ.-5
Graduate School-4	Student Health Center-6	Dean of Students-4
Admiss. and Records-3	Popejoy Hall-2	Univ. College-2
Coll. of Arts & Sciences-1	College of Engineering-1	
Dept. of English-1	Dept. of Physics-1	
Dept. of Elec. Engineer.-1	Dept. of Speech-1	

5. What office was the secretary located in when you spoke to her?
   (Please specify)

Office of Admissions and Records-19	Graduate School-2
College of Arts and Sciences-12	New Mexico Union-1
Dean of Students-9	Student Health Center-1
University College-6	College of Education-1
Placement Center-3	Student Personnel Office-1
Housing-2	

6. What was the nature of the negative experience you had with the secretary? Please describe as best you can.
   (There were 18 apparently different responses to this question; the following five, however, accounted for almost 3/4 of the respondents--42 out of 57)
   Secretary was rude-13;
   Secretary kept me waiting-10;
   Secretary would not admit me to the administrator-7;
   Secretary tried to send me to see someone else-7;
   Secretary said I'd have to come back later-5.

7. Considering all factors, would you at a later date attempt to see the administrator whose secretary gave you a rough time?
   Yes-18 No-31 Don't Know-8

The data in Table 4 indicate that most of the sampled students spoke with one secretary (during the sampled week) for about five minutes or less. A majority (56%) of the sampled students described their experience with the secretary as negative; the most often cited reasons for the "negative experience" were rudeness and delay of time (and sometimes failure to admit the student to the administrator); most of the "negative experiences" reported involved secretaries in the Office of Admissions and Records, College of Arts and Sciences, Dean of Students and University College. The responses involving "positive experiences" referred to secretaries in 15 offices and departments, indicating that most secretaries are probably interacting positively with students. The problem appears to be with a select few secretaries whose behaviors (either intentionally or unintentionally) are apparently barriers to communication between students and the administrators served by the secretaries. This fact is apparent from the results of question seven where 54% of those students who reported negative secretarial interactions indicated that they would NOT attempt to see the administrator at a later date. (31% said they would attempt to see the administrator and 15% said they "didn't know.")

This researcher wishes to emphasize that the results reported in Table 4 would indicate that a majority of secretaries are interacting positively with students; it is a select few secretaries who are apparently acting as barriers to communication between students and administrators. The vital fact to consider when analyzing the data reported above is WHERE these secretaries are located (Office of Admissions and Records, College of Arts and Sciences, Dean of Students, University College, etc.); it is apparent that they serve in offices which interact quite frequently with undergraduate students (perhaps most frequently). This means that the secretaries who appear to be the "barriers" to communication are located in offices where communication is most frequent between undergraduate students and administrators. This fact underscores the severity of the implications of this data.

The following conclusions may be drawn from the data in Table 4:

1. Most of the sampled students (70%) interacted with only one secretary (in the sampled week), and this interaction involved less than five minutes;
2. 56% of the sampled students described their interaction as negative (most often because of rudeness and time delays);
3. 54% of those students reporting negative interactions indicated that they would <u>not</u> (at a later date) attempt to see the administrator;
4. 81% of the negative interactions involved only 4 offices on campus (Office of Admissions and Records, College of Arts and Sciences, Dean of Students, University College);
5. These 4 offices (see conclusion 4) account for frequent interaction between undergraduate students and administrators (indicating that "barriers" exist where communication is most frequent).
6. Most secretaries on the campus of the University of New Mexico appear to be interacting positively with students.

II. Evaluation of Selected Student-Administration Channels

C. President's Weekly "Rap" Session in the Student Union

Since this is a relatively new channel of communication at the University of New Mexico, any evaluative conclusions should be highly tentative. One of the major conclusions drawn from the interviewing of several students, faculty and administrators was that the President needed more exposure to the members of the university community. This researcher agrees with that conclusion, but would suggest that any increased exposure of the President be limited to media where he is most effective (e.g., it would probably not be best to expose the President to a question-answer session in Popejoy Hall.) Since the President, by his own admission, would probably be most effective in a small group situation, the weekly "rap" session in the student union would appear to meet this criterion.

The sessions witnessed by this researcher were primarily information exchanges between the President and the students who were present. The relaxed format allowed for non-structured, highly supportive interactions. Although there were approximately 50-60 students at each session, only about 6-8 different students asked the President any questions; the rest of the students appeared to be listening. Approximately 10-12 different issues were discussed at each session (enrollments, tuition, library, etc.). The decorum of the students present was quite positive; some students became more restless toward the end of the first "rap" session when the President was not specific enough in answering questions. However, this may be because the questions were similar to those asked earlier (some members of the crowd were new); it may be that the President was tired since the first session lasted almost two hours instead of the planned one hour.

This researcher interviewed ten students during each session; my purpose was to get their initial impressions of the President and the "rap" session. The student responses were overwhelmingly positive toward both; only one student at the first session and two at the second questioned the need for such sessions. The rest of those interviewed thought the sessions were quite productive; most of the students were impressed with the President for "taking the time to talk with the students." All but three students said they would probably come back for another session; these same students said they would tell their friends about the "rap" session. The following tentative conclusions may be drawn from the brief evaluation done of this channel (based on two "rap" sessions):

1. The setting of the "rap" sessions (physical setting, number of participants, decorum of participants, etc.) was conducive to the medium where the President is most effective--i.e., the small group;

II. Evaluation of Selected Student-Administration Channels

C. President's Weekly "Rap" Session in the Student Union (cont'd)

2. Although only a few students played an active role in the question-answer format, the President received much exposure from those present who just listened or "passed by";
3. Most of those students interviewed at the "rap" sessions were favorably impressed, indicating a desire to return to future sessions and inform their friends about them.

D. KUNM Interview Show

Since this channel of communication is relatively new at the University of New Mexico, any conclusions drawn about its effectiveness will be highly tentative. The format of the KUNM interview show provides for an exchange of information between students and administrators in a non-threatening, mass communication setting. The shows and the guests are chosen because of the relevance and importance of the issues to the university community. The opportunity to question the administrator by telephone reduces the threat experienced by some students when they talk directly to an administrator. (It may even reduce an administrator's perceived threat when talking to students.) If the number of telephone calls from student listeners were used to gauge the success of this channel, then failure is apparent; only two phone calls (one each show) were received by KUNM. Students may not want to ask questions over the radio, or they may not be listening to the radio at the time of the show. Perhaps as students are informed about the availability of the interview show, their participation will increase. Administrators contacted by this researcher appear willing to participate in this show, and it should be continued until a more scientific polling of student opinion is collected.

III. Recommendations

A. The President and the six Vice-Presidents should re-examine their communication priorities; if student-administration communication is important on a time-priority basis, then steps should be taken to allow time for such interaction. (The following recommendations all assume that time is available.)

B. The "open-door" policy should be re-examined; if the administrator is sincere in his desire to maintain an open-door, he should:
   1. Inform his secretary of this desire;
   2. Inform the student body of this desire;
   3. Be supportive and tolerant of student visitors.

C. Secretaries who are barriers to communication between students and administrators should be:
   1. Replaced by courteous, sensitive females who enjoy interacting with people (especially with students) or
   2. Transferred to offices or departments where their responsibilities do not require them to interact frequently with students, or
   3. Retrained by participating in either communication or sensitivity training sessions designed to improve their interaction with people. (An example of one such communication training session may be to expose problem secretaries to video-taped role-playing scenes of secretary-student interactions; discussions would follow the role-playing.)

D. Informal "rap" sessions (such as the President's student union session) should be continued and expanded with other top administrators (Vice-Presidents, etc.).

E. Better use of the mass media should be employed by top administrators (e.g., KUNM interview shows, weekly or bi-weekly news conferences on KUNM and KNME-TV, Action-line column in the Lobo, etc.).

F. More administrators, especially the top officials, should teach courses (preferably undergraduate courses).

G. The entire top administration of the university should be assembled at least twice a year in Popejoy Hall for an open question-answer session (2-3 hours long); questions could be written out and screened by a faculty chairman to reduce the threat of a shouting match between students and administrators.

III. Recommendations (cont'd)

H. Top administrators should spend 2-3 hours/week walking around the student union mall vicinity for the purpose of meeting students and listening to their suggestions or complaints. (The administration should take the initiative in such an effort, expecting students to at first be quite reluctant to talk to administrators.)

I. The University Governance Committee's suggestion for the implementation of an all University Council should be immediately adopted by students, faculty and administration. Such a council would provide an open forum for discussion of any issue relevant to the university community; the implications of such a council for open communication are obvious.

J. The office of Campus Ombudsman should be established (as discussed by the University Governance Committee). Such an official would act as a channel of communication between students and administrators, students and faculty, and faculty and administration. While his primary function would probably lie in the area of grievances, he could also serve as an expedient to efficient communication (e.g., he might direct a student to the administrator who can best answer his question).

This researcher recognizes that some of these recommendations may not be feasible at this university; however, the importance of establishing a climate of open and permissive communication among all members of the university community cannot be overlooked.

The next section of this report will be concerned primarily with student-faculty channels of communication.

Student-Faculty Channels

Bruno Bettelheim (1969) has stated that a major reason for the revolt of our adolescents is "the fact that our society keeps the younger generation too long dependent in terms of mature responsibility and a striving for independence." It is easy to relate Bettelheim's comments to student cries for curriculum input, course and instructor evaluation, improved instructional techniques, more relevant courses and more available professors. The Linowitz Report states that "traditional educational practices (are emphasized) as a contributing cause of campus unrest." One radical critic of higher educational practices reported to the Linowitz Commission "what faculty know is largely irrelevant and how they teach it is generally obsolete." Jencks (1965) recommends "eliminating lectures, textbooks, memorization, departmental myopia and other impediments to curiosity, while promoting seminars, tutorials, independent study, interdisciplinary courses and the like." He lumps all of these suggestions into one category: "improving communication between professors and their potential apprentices."

The classroom lecture is relied upon today as a principal means of instruction. Dedmon (1970) contends that "university professors maintain the lecture as assiduously as if it were a kind of academic whooping crane. In many cases we persist in lecturing when other communication media would be more effective . . . as it ought to be, and until recently little concern was expressed for the quality of instructional communications." Eble (1970) advises that "teaching which disregards the interaction between student and teacher hardly justifies the holding of formal classes. We possess everything necessary to replace the information-dispensing teacher at a stroke . . . If teachers are to claim a worth at all, it must be in a large sense because of the interactions between teacher and student which move the student to become a self-motivating learner." The University of California at Davis' report on teacher evaluation (1970) found that "a disproportionate number of best teachers were teaching seminar rather than lecture courses . . ." The University of California at Berkely's special report on education (1966) recommended that the faculty should "increase the opportunity of all students for learning based on dialogue . . . by decreasing the proportion of lecture courses in favor of discussion sections . . ." Farnsworth (1965) warns that "when interaction between students and faculty diminishes, the quality of teaching suffers." Huber (1969) reported that students at the University of New Mexico listed the lecture method as one of the complaints they had about their education at the university. From a communication theory point of view, the lecture method appears to violate contemporary definitions of the process of human communication; for example, Berlo (1966) defines communication as a dynamic process involving interaction between the sender and the receiver of the information. The absence of interaction between teacher and student in the lecture method of instruction appears to negate the method as an act of meaningful communication (as operationalized by Berlo and other contemporary spokesmen for communication theory).

Too often undergraduate instruction is left to the teaching assistant who may not always be trained in the technology of teaching. Farnsworth advises that "if teaching assistants are to do the bulk of the individual teaching, it is important that they be encouraged to develop good teaching skills and counseling techniques so that they can be more effective in their work with undergraduates." Klapper (1949) recommended that graduate students be better prepared as teachers before they begin to teach.

Another source of complaints by students (according to the Linowitz Report) is the lack of availability of professors. Huber (1970) reported that "locating assigned advisers to comply with the mandatory system for necessary signatures is a major complaint" (of students seeking advice from faculty advisers). In an earlier report (1969), Huber stated that one complaint students had with their education at the University of New Mexico was that their professors were not accessible. Robertson (1962) suggested that the faculty may not be as available to students as they claim, "faculty themselves can make impassioned speeches in favor of improved student-faculty relations and then scurry to the privacy of their laboratory or their closed office which opens to students every other Saturday from 11-12 by appointment only."

Another student request in the area of instructional communications is the right to evaluate courses and instructors. Communication theory would dictate that the receiver of a message is the best judge of whether the sender's intended message was communicated. Langen (1966) has stated that "despite doubt of the competency of students to judge good teaching, they <u>are</u> the instructor's primary audience. To them he has addressed his communication. If it is unclear to them, he has failed to increase their understanding of course content." Course and instructor evaluation information is usually used on a college campus for one or two purposes (or both): to improve instruction and for faculty advancement decisions. The latter faculty seem to object to most. However, the present system of evaluating faculty teaching performance appears to rely upon second-hand information at best. The 1966 Astin and Lee study of the evaluation of teaching effectiveness (as cited in Eble, 1970) "made clear that the judgment of a chairman or dean, supported or confirmed by the opinions of departmental colleagues, is the most commonly-used means of evaluating an individual faculty member's teaching competence. Firsthand knowledge of a faculty member's teaching plays a small part in this kind of evaluation, and scholarly research and publication and other inferential evidences of teaching competence are given substantial weight . . . If the ultimate measure of the teacher's effectiveness is his impact on the student--a view which few educators would dispute--it is unfortunate that those sources of information most likely to yield information about this influence are least likely to be used." Finally, the Princeton Report on Student Evaluation (1968) concluded that "the administration of questionnaires of the kind we have tried are important in giving students a sense of greater participation in their education. There is no need to belabor the significance of this factor at the present crisis in education. The more we can persuade students to comment thoughtfully and responsibly on their courses and their instructors,

and the more we can convince them that their comments are seriously considered, the more Princeton can do for its students and for the cause of higher education in this restless and rebellious age."

According to the Linowitz Report, one of the major issues present on campuses which had violent protest was that of student involvement in curriculum decisions. Muston (1969) states that the "most frequent means of involving both faculty and students was through membership on standing and advisory committees." The Berkely Report (1966) recommended that the "faculty and administration should regularly consult students' views on educational policy both in campus-wide and in departmental affairs. Campus-wide, the students have the major responsibility to develop effective channels of communication; within each department, however, the chairman and faculty should take the initiative." The Linowitz Commission recommended that students should "participate in matters of general educational policy, especially in curricular affairs . . . . Effective student representation will not only improve the quality of decisions; it will also help to ensure their acceptability to the student body." Eble (1970) advised that "the faculty, far from being defensive about involving students, should seek ways of getting their particpation, not by one or two or three student representatives serving on committees or being invited to meetings, but by a much larger kind of participation. Few departments are so large that open meetings on key questions cannot be held. Students could be urged to attend, and their ideas and opinions, like those of the faculty, could be listened to and challenged." In all fairness to faculty, it should be pointed out that it is a great imposition on a faculty member's time to be involved in committee meetings (which are the usual channels recommended for student involvement). The Linowitz Report stated that "Faculty members complain that today's students are exceedingly demanding of their time, and that student-faculty committee deliberations tend to go on endlessly. Faculty serving jointly with students on committees, having devoted countless hours to debate and to the preparation of reports, finally assert that they are weary--that they have had it and want to get back to their own research and educational interests." Keene (1970) concludes "while it is obvious that there must be some campus-wide committees, too many can have deleterious effects: they can become time-consuming and frustrating . . . but most important, the more experienced faculty member tends to withdraw from the committee arena to devote his efforts to the classroom and his scholarly interests . . . those who remain are less representative of the spectrum of campus opinion."

The above brief scan of the literature indicates that students are quite concerned about certain areas of faculty-student interaction: the quality of instruction by faculty members (primarily criticizing the lecture method) and teaching assistants, the availability of professors, course and instructor evaluation and student input into curriculum matters. These and other channels of communication between UNM faculty and students will be described and evaluated in the next section of this report.

I. Description of Existing Channels at the University of New Mexico

A. Classroom

Most professors at the University of New Mexico teach between 6-12 hours each week; some professors teach less than 6 hours/ week in order to perform extensive research or certain administrative duties. Most undergraduate student contact with professors occurs in the classroom situation. The description and evaluation of this channel will include reference to video-taped courses, sections taught by teaching assistants and course and instructor evaluation.

Presently at the University of New Mexico only three departments use video-taped lectures for undergraduate courses (Psychology, Sociology and Electrical Engineering--the Medical School uses video-tapes for supplementary purposes). A brief evaluation of this medium's effectiveness with one course (Psychology 101) will be presented in the next section. Graduate and teaching assistants at the university account for 18% (461) of all sections taught during the current (fall) semester; five departments (Modern and Classical Languages, English, Mathematics, Geology and Art) account for 90% of these sections. A synopsis of this data appears in the next section. Course and instructor evaluation at the University of New Mexico exists only on an Ad Hoc basis. No department or college requires their faculty to submit data from such methods to be used for promotion and tenure considerations. Presently, student government sponsors a course evaluation which is voluntary for participating faculty members and (this semester) is limited primarily to large lecture courses. The information will be published in booklet form when the results are compiled. Some professors, a few departments and one college (Engineering) have regular informal evaluations (on a voluntary basis) with the resulting information restricted to the participating faculty member's use. In April, 1968 the faculty of the university defeated a proposal which would have established a mandatory course and instructor evaluation for all faculty members. The next section of this report will evaluate some of the present measures being used on this campus.

B. Office Hours

The Faculty Handbook of the University of New Mexico (p. 112) states, "It is expected that each faculty member will make himself available for student consultation at regular hours, either in his office or elsewhere. These hours are to be posted on the faculty member's door and entered on the Faculty Data Card. Although the situation will vary among departments and individuals, a total of from three to five hours per week is recommended.

The effectiveness of this channel will be evaluated in the next section of this report. Twenty-five per cent of the UNM

I. Description of Existing Channels at the University of New Mexico

B. Office Hours (cont'd)

faculty (170) were surveyed in an attempt to find out if they were available to students during their posted office hours. In addition, 200 students (of the available faculty members) were asked how often they consulted with the professor during his posted office hours and what reasons they had for seeing him or not seeing him during his posted hours. The results of this evaluation are reported in the next section.

C. Committee Meetings

This channel refers to all committees which have students and faculty on them (some may also have administrators). Included here are student committees (e.g., Student Affairs Committee, Speakers Committee, etc.), faculty committees (e.g., Campus Planning Committee, Entrance and Credits Committee, etc.), Ad Hoc Committees (e.g., University Governance Committee--which was actually formed by the Regents), Miscellaneous Committees, College Committees, etc. Most of these committees meet weekly for an average of about 1-3 hours per meeting. This channel obviously overlaps administrator-student communication, and its evaluation appears in the next section of this report.

D. Student Curriculum Inputs (at College and Department Levels)

This channel refers to means by which students have a voice in departmental and college curriculum (and other academic) matters. This channel may overlap classroom and committee channels discussed above; for example, course and instructor evaluation would refer to both classroom and curriculum channels. However, the intent here is to specify primarily those channels operating at the departmental level, whereas above the intent was to refer primarily to matters of concern to the entire university. This channel might also include matters of grievances between students and faculty members at the departmental level. Data for evaluating this channel was provided primarily by independent surveys conducted by the University Governance Committee and the President of the Associated Student Body; this data will be presented in the next section.

E. General Faculty Meetings

The University Faculty normally meets at 3:00 P.M. on the second Tuesday of each month during the school year (according to the Faculty Handbook). Fifteen students (12 undergraduate and 3 graduate) are allowed to attend each meeting, providing they register in advance with the Faculty Secretary; these students do not have voting rights, but they may speak when recognized by the Chairman. A brief evaluation of this channel appears in the next section.

I. Description of Existing Channels at the University of New Mexico

F. Advisement System and Counseling Center

The Faculty Handbook states that "Advisement is a normal faculty duty, and each faculty member is expected to serve as an advisor for an assigned group of students. Certain faculty members will be assigned to the University College to advise lower-division students; others will advise upper-division students from the degree-granting colleges; still others will advise graduate students. In some cases, an advisor might be responsible for students in all three categories." The advisor's function is to assist the student in the planning of his curriculum, although frequently the advisor discusses related areas of the student's life (according to the Faculty Handbook) such as study habits, outside work, or moral and emotional problems.* A brief evaluation (based on data from both University College and my own experience as an advisor) follows in the next section.

*The University College provides a Counseling Center staffed by counseling psychologists; the academic advisor may refer students to the Counseling Center as necessary.

G. AMISTAD - The Free University

Amistad was created in May, 1970 (during the unrest which resulted from the Cambodian invasion) as an alternative to formal classes. The intent of Amistad is to provide unstructured, informal classes led by instructors (faculty, students, etc.) who facilitate discussion rather than lecture to audiences. There is no compulsory attendance, tuition or grading; classes may meet anywhere although space is available in the Honors Center or the New Mexico Union. Amistad is funded by Associated Students and has its office in the Honors Center. A brief evaluation of its effectiveness as a channel of communication between students and faculty follows in the next section.

H. Student Organizations with Faculty Advisors

A few campus organizations (professional fraternities, social fraternities and sororities, clubs, etc.) have faculty members serving as official or unofficial advisors. For example, Sigma Tau, the Engineering Professional Fraternity, has a faculty member serving as its official advisor. This is primarily an informal channel of communication between students and faculty and does not involve too many faculty members. Meetings of these organizations vary; some meet weekly and others meet less often (bi-weekly or monthly). This is an opportunity for those faculty members who enjoy cultivating close personal relations with students. No data for evaluating this or any of the remaining channels is provided.

I. Description of Existing Channels at the University of New Mexico

I. D. H. Lawrence Ranch Conferences

This channel was described above (see student-administration channels) and will be evaluated in Part II (university-public channels).

J. Informal Channels

Included here would be lunches, dinners, etc. with students and faculty eating together at the New Mexico Union, dormitories, fraternities, sororities, restaurants, apartments, homes, etc. Also included here would be coffee lounge gatherings (such as exists in the College of Engineering--rather successfully according to several Engineering students and faculty), beer drinking gatherings (at local bars or at other social gatherings, e.g. parties), and occasional seminars held at a faculty member's home. Although no formal evaluation of these informal channels was made, the food director of the residence halls reported that as of November 1, 1970 only nine faculty members had eaten at the dormitory dining hall as guests of students (and this researcher accounted for two of those meals). In addition, only the College of Engineering and the School of Business and Administrative Sciences (of the larger colleges at the university) maintain coffee lounges where students and faculty may communicate in an informal setting.

K. Agora I (The Crisis Center)

This channel of communication was initiated by the Chairman of the Psychology Department as a result of a student suicide on campus last spring (1970). Students may come in to the crisis center or "call up with any sort of personal difficulties ranging from poor study habits and disillusionment with school to conditions of impending suicide" (according to the Lobo, October 6, 1970). At the crisis center they would talk with either trained student volunteers or psychologists; students may also be referred to other community resources if necessary.

L. Miscellaneous Channels

This channel refers to written media, bulletin boards, off-campus retreats, grapevine, etc. (See student-administration channels for a more complete description of the miscellaneous channels on this campus.)

II. Evaluation of Selected Student-Faculty Channels

A. Classroom

According to the Office of Institutional Research for this university, the average teaching load (in credit hours) for the faculty is 8.59 (based on fall, 1969 figures) hours. This figure is broken down by college in the following: Nursing-3.44; Pharmacy-4.46; Law-6.16; Engineering-7.45; Arts and Sciences-8.75; Business and Administrative Sciences-8.93; Fine Arts-10.37; Education-10.68. Evaluation of this channel is divided into three parts: video-taped instruction; teaching assistants; and course and instructor evaluation.

1. Video-taped instruction. Video-taped instruction at the University of New Mexico is in its infancy. Only three courses use video-taped lectures: Sociology 101 (the tapes are pre-made, studio tapes and the lecturer is not on campus at the present time); Electrical Engineering 361-362 (the tapes are 1/2 hour pre-made, studio lectures which supplement the module approach to the course); Psychology 101 (the tapes are made live with a lecturer who remains in the classroom when they are shown to subsequent classes). A more extensive evaluation of Psychology 101's use of video-taped instruction follows.

Psychology 101 (Introduction to Psychology) meets twice a week (Tuesday and Thursday) for 1 hour and 15 minutes a class in the Anthropology Lecture Hall. Approximately 600 students are enrolled in each of the three sections of the course. The first section's lecture (about 40-45 minutes) is delivered live while it is being video-taped for later use in the other two sections. Approximately 20-25 minutes of each class period is used for questions and demonstrations (students write their questions on 3 x 5 cards and turn them in to the lecturer). The lecturer is present in all three sections of the course even though he only delivers one live lecture per day. Two lecturers are utilized in the course, one until mid-term, one after mid-term. The video-taping is done with one camera provided by the Instructional Media Services of the University; the cameraman is an undergraduate student who was formerly employed by KNME-TV. The video-tape is erased immediately after the last class in an attempt to save money and guarantee spontaneity from the lecturers. The Psychology Department prefers the above approach to video-taping over the studio approach (which they used two years ago) because it is more spontaneous and there is a live audience to whom the lecturer may react. The Department (according to its chairman) is pleased with the use of video-taped lectures because of the physical benefits to the lecturer (saves wear and tear on voice, etc.), because it guarantees that a common body of knowledge is transmitted to all 1800 students, and lastly, there was no significant difference among the mid-term scores of all three sections (live-49.8, video-50.4, video-48.0).

The Psychology Department administered a seven item questionnaire with the mid-term examination in order to assess student opinions toward the video-taped lectures. The results of this survey are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Psychology Questionnaire on Video-taped Lectures

1. Do you regularly attend the live lecture or the taped sections?
   a. attend live lecture - 43%
      attend tape lecture - 57%

If you regularly attend the live lecture, please do not answer the remaining questions.

2. If you regularly attend the tape sections, how do you like this this procedure as presented so far this semester?
   a. I like the TV presentations.--19%
   b. I do not like the TV presentations.--37%
   c. It really doesn't matter to me whether it is live or on tape. --44%

3. Where do you regularly sit in class?
   a. towards the front b. towards the middle c. towards the back
   (no data available on this question)

4. As you know, there have been many technical problems with the television. On the assumption that the problems can be corrected, such as improved audio tone, better location of the TV receivers, more light so that the picture is clearer, etc., do you think the TV can be made into an effective instructional device?
   a. Yes - 82%
   b. No - 18%

5. While watching the TV tapes, do you prefer the instructor to remain in the room or not?
   a. Instructor should remain in the room.--49%
   b. Instructor should not be in the room.-- 1%
   c. It doesn't matter.--50%

6. Assuming the technical aspects of the TV are perfect, would you prefer
   a. Class entirely by TV. You never see a live instructor.--1%
   b. Class partly ty TV, approximately 45-60 min. on TV and a live instructor for 15-30 min.--90%
   c. No preference.--9%

7. What bothers you the most about the TV presentations this semester?
   a. the technical problems with the video and audio--35%
   b. feeling that I am not learning as much--7%
   c. bad angle of TV receivers--13%
   d. overcrowded classroom--8%
   e. difficulty in taking notes during lecture--7%
   f. lack of personal contact with instructor--29%

It is apparent from the data in Table 5 that about 1/3 of the students who regularly attend video-taped lectures in Psychology 101 were not happy with the taped presentation at the time of this questionnaire. The major reasons they cited for disliking the tapes were the technical problems and the lack of personal contact with an instructor. However, over 80% of those students thought that TV could be an effective instructional device provided that the technical problems were cleared up; and 90% of them would prefer a combination of TV and live instructor, provided the technical problems were solved. It would appear, therefore, that if the technical problems (lighting, camera lens, microphone, etc.) were corrected, most students would not object to video-taped instructional techniques as used by Psychology 101.

It should be pointed out that since this questionnaire was administered, the Psychology Department has taken steps to correct the technical problems: new lights and video-tapes have been purchased, and a new microphone is in use. These technical improvements should influence the results of this questionnaire when it is readministered at the end of the semester. The Psychology Department does not plan to use video-taped lectures next semester; at present they do intend to use them again next fall. At that time they hope to be able to allow students to select the section of their choice (i.e., those students who object to video-taped lectures will be allowed to attend the live lecture).

2. Teaching Assistants. Table 6 presents a summary of the number of sections taught during the current fall semester by either graduate or teaching assistants. Graduate assistants account for 183 sections and teaching assistants account for 278 sections; there are 2567 sections of courses being currently offered; 18% of these sections are taught by graduate or teaching assistants. Five departments (Modern and Classical Languages, English, Mathematics, Geology and Art) account for 90% of these sections. Data from the departments was supplied by the secretaries; Elementary Education was unable to provide the necessary data. It may be concluded from the above data, therefore, that approximately one of every five undergraduate class sections currently offered is staffed by a graduate or teaching assistant. (The above data includes lab, quiz, discussion and lecture sections.)

Table 6

Number of Graduate and Teaching Assistants Currently Teaching Class Sections

Department	No. Sections Taught by G.A.'s	No. Sections Taught by T.A.'s
Modern and Classical Languages	50	37
Art Education	2	2
Math and Statistics	29	59
English	8	120
Economics	0	4
Guidance and Special Education	0	2
Electrical Engineering	3	7
Geology	34	28
Philosophy	0	10
Educational Foundations	9	0
Art	44	2
Mechanical Engineering	0	3
Civil Engineering	4	4
Total	183	278

Total of both G.A.'s and T.A.'s - 461

Total Number of Undergraduate Course Sections Currently (Fall Semester, 1970) Being Taught, Including labs, quiz, discussion and lecture -- 2567

3. Course and Instructor Evaluation

At the present time at the University of New Mexico, course and instructor evaluation exists on a voluntary basis, i.e., if a faculty member desires to be evaluated by his students, either he or some student group administers an evaluation form, the information of which remains in his possession to do with as he pleases. No college or department requires that a faculty member submit student evaluation data as evidence of good teaching. The Faculty Handbook (pp. 52-53) states that teaching is one of the four areas considered for promotion to a higher rank: "Even though teaching may be more difficult to evaluate than scholarship, research, or creative work, it should not therefore be given a place of secondary consideration in over-all rating . . . Teaching is admittedly difficult to define precisely or to assess accurately. It is commonly considered to include a person's knowledge of his field, his keeping abreast of developments in it, his skill in communicating to his students and in arousing their interest . . ." The Handbook goes on to describe sources of information which have been found useful in evaluating the criteria for promotion. For teaching: "1. Consult colleagues in the candidat's field and those in allied fields; 2. Seek out student opinion.

3. Course and Instructor Evaluation (cont'd)

In the absence of a reliable system for student evaluation, this method needs to be used with great care; 3. Direct observation of a faculty member's performance of his duties may well be included."

This researcher interviewed several deans and department chairmen at this university; the question was asked: what criteria do you follow for evaluating a faculty member's teaching effectiveness? The only case where second-hand information is not used, according to the interviewees, appears to be when a faculty member submits data from student evaluations which he or students solicited. Otherwise, the predominant method for evaluating teaching effectiveness on this campus appears to be (as one full professor put it) "academic gossip." For example, students may complain about a particular professor to his chairman or dean; colleagues may report favorably about a faculty member's teaching (on the basis of "what they have heard"); enrollments in the faculty member's courses may either increase or decrease (the inference being made that decreased enrollments are an index of bad teaching); etc., etc.

It is apparent, therefore, that although the Faculty Handbook includes teaching as one of the two major criteria used for promoting faculty members, no systematic method exists on this campus for evaluating good or bad teaching, other than "academic gossip."

The absence of an evaluation of instruction is not due to a lack of interest or desire from the students. Student government, for the past few years, has been publishing an annual course evaluation booklet based on data collected from cooperating instructors' classes. The instruments which the students have employed have been criticized by several students and faculty members alike. For example, one instrument summarized and reported student comments about selected professors; it was attacked for a lack of representative student inputs and biased reporting of the results. A more recent instrument was criticized on statistical grounds (means for groups of questions were lumped together and reported as one mean score, for example); furthermore, it was extremely difficult to interpret the published results.

Some of the above criticism appears just, and perhaps the lack of a valid and reliable instrument on this campus is one factor influencing several faculty members who oppose evaluation of their teaching.

3. Course and Instructor Evaluation (cont'd)

Evaluation on this campus exists in one of three forms:

a. Totally closed system administered by students.

An example of this would be the instrument administered by Sigma Tau Engineering Honorary Fraternity. Faculty members who desire to participate contact a member of Sigma Tau, who administers the instrument and has the results sent directly to the faculty member. While the main purpose of this method of evaluation would be to improve instruction, the Dean of the College of Engineering encourages faculty members to submit the data to him as one piece of evidence to be used in evaluating him for promotion, etc. (About 40% of the College of Engineering faculty employ this technique.)

b. Totally closed system administered by a faculty member.

An example of this would be one faculty member in the College of Education(where many members of the faculty employ this method) administering an instrument which he devised to his students. The results would only be seen by him to be used for improving his own instruction, or they could be submitted to his superiors, if he desired. Neither of these two methods are published. (About 1/3 of the College of Engineering and about 1/2 of the School of Business use this technique.)

c. Completely open system administered by students.

An example of this would be the current instrument used by student government (a nine item questionnaire, with eight multiple choice questions--five of which require yes-no responses--and one open-ended question requiring an essay response). Faculty members participate on a voluntary basis and the results will be published in booklet form with campus-wide distribution. Students will use this booklet primarily as a course and instructor guide for the coming semester; faculty members may use the results to improve their instruction or submit them to their superiors for advancement considerations (since it is a published booklet, there's a good chance that his chairman or dean has read the results anyway) but this is not required of the faculty at the present time.

3. Course and Instructor Evaluation (cont'd)

It is apparent that when course and instructor evaluation is not mandatory and when the results are not submitted to deans and department chairman for promotion considerations, faculty do not feel threatened by the concept. Under those conditions, the faculty has allowed evaluation to exist; but when a mandatory instrument is proposed to be used by superiors for promotion decisions (such as the instrument proposed to the faculty in April, 1968) the faculty of this university voices their opposition. Despite the role of students as receivers of information (in the classroom communication model), no organized attempt exists to monitor their feedback, a vital ingredient in the process of human communication.

Conclusions (for classroom channels)

1. The average teaching load at the University of New Mexico (based on 1969 figures) is 8.59 credit hours;
2. Video-taped instruction at the university is in its infancy; only three courses use video-taped lectures;
3. One video-taped course, Psychology 101, evaluated its use of TV and found no significant difference in mid-term exam scores between the live and taped sections. In addition, students in the course complained about the technical problems which existed as one factor in their unhappiness with TV; 80% of them, however, thought TV was effective and 90% would prefer a combination of live and TV lectures, provided that the technical problems were corrected. (Since this survey, the Psychology Department has corrected these problems.)
4. Approximately one out of every five undergraduate course sections presently scheduled are taught by graduate or teaching assistants. Five departments (Modern and Classical Languages, English, Math, Geology and Art) account for 90% of these sections.
5. Despite the Faculty Handbook's indication that good teaching was one criterion considered for faculty promotion decisions, no formal method exists at the University of New Mexico for evaluating teaching effectiveness. The present system of evaluation relies primarily on second-hand information (student reports, colleagues' opinions, course enrollments, etc.) and only considers first-hand information (observation, studdnt questionnaires, etc.) when a faculty member chooses to volunteer such information.
6. Student interest in evaluation of instructors is evidenced by the several instruments which they have devised in the past few years (which have been criticized for statistical reasons).
7. Current attempts to evaluate instructors are not mandatory and the information is not submitted for promotion decisions unless the faculty member desires.
8. The lack of student opinion in an evaluation system violates the principle of feedback, axiomatic to human communication theory.

II. Evaluation of Selected Student-Faculty Channels

B. Office Hours

The overall question of effectiveness of this channel was divided into two parts: Is the faculty accessible to the students during posted office hours? and If the faculty is accessible, do students take advantage of this channel to communicate with faculty members? Why or why not? The test of the first question involved surveying students of only those faculty members who were available during the first survey.

A stratefied random sample of 170 (25.4%) faculty members was selected from the faculty directory. The strata were so selected to proportionally represent each college, each rank and each rank within each college. Office hours were obtained from either the faculty data card (which was posted on the faculty member's office door) or from the departmental or college secretary. Professors who were sick, on sabbatical, out of town, etc. were not included in this study. The procedure involved calling or visiting a professor 4-5 times during his posted office hours; the calls and visits were evenly distributed throughout the week so as to adequately represent a faculty member's office hours. For example, if a professor posted office hours of 9-10 A.M. Monday and Wednesday, 2-3 P.M. Tuesday and Thursday, he may have been called or visited at 9:15 A.M. Monday, 2:15 P.M. Tuesday, 9:45 A.M. Wednesday, and 2:45 P.M. Thursday. If during a visit to a professor, his door was shut, we knocked on it and waited for a response; if his door was open and he was not in, we waited approximately five minutes, asked if anyone knew where he was and then left (a procedure which students may use). Phone calls were allowed to ring 10-15 times before hanging up. Availability was operationalized as 50% success in locating a professor by phone or visit during his posted hours; i.e., if he were called 4 times and was in the office two or more times, he was listed as available. If a professor posted "By Appointment Only" as his office hours (as did 56 of our sample), the procedure for calling was modified as follows: the departmental or college secretary (and in some cases the faculty member himself) were asked when would be the best times to see the professor in his office; he was then called or visited 5 times during these hours. Since the method for sampling "By Appointment Only's" was less scientific than the procedure for sampling professors who posted hours, the criterion for availability was reduced to 2 of five calls or visits. The results are reported for each rank, for each college, and for those colleges with a sample large enough to analyze, by rank within college.

Table 7 reports the results of the office hour survey by rank only; since the sample for the rank of lecturer was too small for meaningful statistical analysis, they were combined with instructors. The results in Table 7 indicate that 66% of the Associate Professors were available at least 50% of the time; Instructors

B. Office Hours (cont'd)

and Lecturers-64%; Professors-57%; Assistant Professors-55%; Total across all ranks-59%. Associate Professors and Instructors-Lecturers were the most available of the faculty; the differences were statistically significant (Chi-square, $p < .01$).

Table 7

Office Hours Availability by Academic Rank Only

Academic Rank	Per cent of Faculty Available
Professor (n=47)	57.4%*
Associate Professor (n=41)	65.8%
Assistant Professor (n=60)	55.0%
Instructor and Lecturer (n=22)	63.6%
Total (n=170)	59.3%

*Chi Square, $p < .01$

Table 8

Office Hours Availability by College or School Only

College or School	Per cent of Faculty Available
Arts and Sciences (n=68)	67.6%*
Fine Arts (n=16)	56.2%
Business (n=4)	100.0%
Law (n=4)	75.0%
Engineering (n=14)	50.0%
Education (n=25)	60.0%
Nursing (n=7)	28.6%
Medicine (n=30)	46.7%
Pharmacy (n=1)	100.0%
ROTC (n=1)	0.0%
Total (n=170)	59.3%

*Chi Square, $p < .01$

Table 8 reports the results of the office hour survey by college or school only; the samples for ROTC, Pharmacy, Law and Business were too small for meaningful statistical analysis, and, therefore, were not included in the Chi Square analysis. The results indicate that 68% of the total faculty of College of Arts and Sciences were available; Education - 60%; Fine Arts - 56%; Engineering - 50%;

B. Office Hours (cont'd)

Medicine - 47%; Nursing - 29%; the differences were statistically significant (Chi Square, p .01). Multiple Chi Squares were not performed, but an examination of the results will indicate initially where the differences occur among the colleges. Even though the samples for four colleges were not included in the Chi Square analysis, the percentages for their availability are reported in Table 8.

Table 9

Office Hours Availability by Rank Within College or School

College or School	Academic Rank	Per cent of Faculty Available
Arts and Sciences	Professor (n=20)	50.0%*
	Associate Professor (n=19)	78.9%
	Assistant Professor (n=25)	68.0%
	Instructor (n=4)	100.0%
	(not included in Chi Square)	
	Total (n=68)	67.6%
Education	Professor (n=7)	42.9%*
	Associate Professor (n=6)	66.7%
	Assistant Professor (n=8)	50.0%
	Instructor (n=4)	
	(not included in Chi Square)	100.0%
	Total (n-25)	60.0%
Medicine	Professor (n=5)	40.0%*
	Associate Professor (n=5)	40.0%
	Assistant Professor (n=14)	50.0%
	Instructor & Lecturer (n=6)	50.0%
	Total (n=30)	46.7%

(The other colleges' samples were not sufficiently large enough to allow meaningful statistical analysis.)

*Chi Square, p $<$.01

Table 9 presents the office hours data by rank within those colleges with samples large enough to permit meaningful statistical analysis. In all three of the above colleges (Arts and Sciences, Education and Medicine) the rank of full professor was the least available during posted office hours; in Arts and Sciences and Education, the rank of Associate Professor was most available; in Medicine, Assistant Professor and Instructor-Lecturer tied for the most available.

The average number of office hours per week for the sample of 170 faculty members was 4.91 hours; those faculty members who were concluded to be "available" (on the basis of the above data) maintained an average of 4.11 hours per week; those who were

B. Office Hours (cont'd)

found to be "unavailable" averaged 6.60 hours per week. It is apparent, therefore, that the "unavailable" professors post more hours than the "available" professors; this may explain their apparent availability (i.e., the "available" professors have fewer hours posted per week and this may be why they are in more than the "unavailable" professors.)

The first research question asked in testing the effectiveness of this channel was: Is the faculty accessible to the students during posted office hours? On the basis of the above data, the answer is that approximately 60% of the total faculty of the University of New Mexico is available at least 50% of the time during posted hours (which may not be that effective, considering the conservative definition of availability - 50%). The second research question asked: If the faculty is accessible, do students take advantage of this channel to communicate with faculty members? Why or why not? In order to answer this question we concerned ourselves only with the students of the 101 "available" faculty members.

A random sample of 200 students was drawn from the class lists (Fall semester, 1970) of the 101 faculty members judged to be available from the above data. A short three-item questionnaire was mailed to these students, and the results of this questionnaire are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Office Hours Questionnaire and Responses (n=76)

1. How many times this semester have you met with Professor _____ during his posted office hours?
   None-49 One-22 Two-5 Three-0 Four-0 Five or more-0

2. If you have met with him at least once, what was the main purpose of the meeting(s) (Please specify) (Based on 32 meetings)
   a. To discuss an examination - 7
   b. To discuss grades - 18
   c. To discuss an assignment - 3
   d. To discuss a reading - 1
   e. To clarify a lecture point - 1
   f. To discuss a private matter - 1
   g. To discuss a social matter - 1

3. If you have not met with him yet, why not? (Please specify)
   a. No need to meet with him - 20
   b. Personality conflict - 4
   c. Professor was not in office when I came - 5
   d. My schedule conflicts with his office hours - 14
   e. I don't know his office hours - 6

B. Office Hours (cont'd)

Only 76 returns to the questionnaire were received by this researcher; therefore, any conclusions based on these results should be highly tentative. Over 64% of those students who returned their questionnaires indicated that they had not met yet with the professor whose name appeared on their questionnaire. The two main reasons given were: schedule conflicts and no apparent need to meet with him. Most of the 36% of the students who had met at least once with their professor indicated that they did so to discuss either grades or an examination.

We also asked twenty of the "available" professors to give us their best estimate of the number of students per week who visit them during posted office hours. This averaged out to 4-5 students/week. It is apparent, therefore, that just having a professor sit in his office during posted office hours is not going to guarantee the effectiveness of that channel. It may be that students will not come to the office unless they have to, e.g., to discuss grades or exams. However, the channel of communication cannot begin to be effective until the professor himself is available. He may not want to see students and has communicated this attitude (either intentionally or unintentionally) to his students; students, on the other hand, may not want to see professors for any reason unless they must. Or it may be that the professor is doing such an effective job in class that there is no need to interact with the students outside of class.

A final comment is necessary here. Only 46.7% of the Medical School faculty was available according to the above data. Before any interpretations of this data are made, it is necessary to understand that all 30 of the sampled faculty from this school listed their office hours as "By Appointment Only." Two factors may account for this low percentage of availability: the calls or visits may not have been during hours when the faculty members were most likely to be in their offices (since they posted no hours, the secretary advised us when the "best" time to see them would be); and secondly, since the faculty are doctors and spend many hours in either the hospital or the laboratory, they may be quite accessible to their students at those locations. Indeed, scant interviewing of just seven Medical School students indicated that this may well be the case. Therefore, the Medical School faculty may be more available than the percentage indicated above.

Conclusions for Office Hours

1. 59% of the total sampled faculty (n=170) were available during posted office hours (at least 50% of the time).

2. Associate Professors were more available during posted office hours than faculty members of any other rank (66% of the associate professors at UNM were available at least 50% of the time). Next in order of availability were: Instructors and Lecturers - 64%; Professors - 57%; Assistant Professors - 55% (n=170)

3. The College of Arts and Sciences' faculty members were available during posted office hours more than faculty members in any other school or college (68% of the sampled faculty of Arts and Sciences were available at least 50% of the time). Next in order of availability were: College of Education - 60%; College of Fine Arts - 56%; College of Engineering - 50%; School of Medicine - 47%; School of Nursing - 29%. (The samples studied for the Schools of Law, Pharmacy and ROTC were too small for meaningful statistical analysis.)

4. Within the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Education and the School of Medicine, the rank of Professor was the least available during posted office hours; in Arts and Sciences and Education, the rank of Associate Professor was most available; in Medicine, Assistant Professor and Instructor-Lecturer tied for the most available. (Small samples prohibited a rank within college analysis of the other schools and colleges.)

5. The average number of office hours posted per week for the studied sample (n=170) was 4.91 hours; the "available" faculty members posted an average of 4.11 hours and the "unavailable" an average of 6.60 hours. The "available" faculty members, therefore, posted approximately two hours per week less than the "unavailable" faculty members (which may explain their availability).

6. Over 64% of a sample of surveyed students (based on 76 returns) indicated that they had not yet met their professor (who was one of the "available" faculty members); schedule conflicts and no perceived need to talk with the professor were the most often cited reasons for not meeting with him. Most of the 36% of the students who indicated at least one meeting with their professor did so to apparently discuss either grades or an examination.

7. A sample of twenty "available" professors indicated tht they see approximately 4-5 students per week during their posted office hours.

8. Overall Conclusion: The office hour does not appear to be an effective channel of communication between students and faculty members at UNM. Only 59% of the sampled faculty were maintaining their posted hours and those that were adhering to those hours were not seeing too many students per week (4-5). Students (on the basis of 76 responses) appear most anxious to see a professor to discuss grades or exams; and usually don't see a professor because of schedule conflicts or lack of a perceived need to communicate with him.

C. Committee Meetings

The Faculty Handbook lists 31 standing university committees, 10 administrative committees, 8 student committees (and mentions that college and regents committees exist). Table 11 lists the 31 standing committees, their membership (i.e., the number of students, faculty, administrators, etc.), the frequency and the average length of time of their meetings. Table 12 summarizes the data from Table 11.

Table 11

Description of the 31 Standing University Committees

Committee	Membership *F	S	A	O	Number of Monthly Meetings	Average # Hours/Meeting
Academic Freedom and Tenure	9	0	0	0	1	2-3
Administrative	4	2	22	0	On call (has not met this year)	2-3 (last year)
Athletic Council	6	4	1	1	1	2
Campus Planning	7	1	6	1	1	2
Campus Safety	4	4	7	0	1	2
Computer Use	10	2	4	0	1	2
Continuing Education	9	1	7	0	Every other month	1
Cultural Program	5	8	3	0	Has not met this year	
Curricula	9	2	0	0	2	2
Entrance and Credits	2	2	15	0	1	3-4
General Honors	6	1	0	0	4-5 meetings/year	2
Graduate	14	2	5	0	1	3-4
University Committee on Human Subjects	7	1	1	0	Has not met this year	1 (last yr.)
Intramural and Recreation Board	2	4	2	0	Has not met this year	1 (last yr.)
Library	11	3	3	0	2	3
National and International Affairs	2	3	1	0		
New Mexico Union	2	7	4	0	2	2
New Student Orientation	4	4	5	0	Has not met this year	
Policy	13	0	0	0	4	2-3
Publications	9	0	2	0	4-5 meetings/year	3
Registration	7	2	2	0	1	2
Research Allocations	9	0	0	0	1	2
Research Policy	29	0	8	0	1	3
Retirement and Ins.	7	0	2	0	2-3	2-3
Scholarships, Prizes	10	3	4	0	2-3 meetings/year	2
Speakers	3	8	3	0	3-4	2-3
Student Affairs	5	5	1	0	Has not met this year	
Student Publications	4	5	0	1	1	1-2
Student Radio Board	4	5	0	1	1	2
Student Standards	5	4	2	0	On call	2
Committee on Univ.	4	6	4	2	2	2
Total	222	89	114	6--431	31-32	56-61

*F=Faculty; S=Students (undergraduate and graduate); A=Administration; O=Other (usually alumni). The above figures include Ex officio members. (Department chairmen were included in the faculty category.)

C. Committee Meetings (cont'd)

Table 12

Summary of Data on Standing University Committees

I. Composition of University Standing Committees

Faculty	52.4% (n=222)
Administration	26.4% (n=114)
Students	20.6% (n= 89)
Other (Alumni, etc.)	0.6% (n= 6)
Total	100.0% (n=431)

II. Average Length of Meetings - 2 hours

III. Frequency of Meetings Per Month

# Committees	# Monthly Meetings
5*	Have not met yet this year.
6	Bi-monthly, less often or on call.
12	One
5	Two-three
1	Three-four
1	Four
1	No information available at the time of this report.
31	

IV. Number of Committees with Student Membership Equal to or Greater than Faculty or Administration - 14.

V. Number of Committees with 50% or more Students - 7

VI. Number of Committees without any Students - 6
Number of Committees without any Faculty - 0
Number of Committees without any Administrators - 7.

*These committees have not met yet because they lack student members; student members have been delayed confirmation because of the lack of a quorum in the Student Senate (which as of this writing has been corrected).

It is apparent from the data in Tables 11 and 12 that faculty compose a majority of the membership on the University's Standing Committees (faculty account for over 1/2, administration for over 1/4 and students for about 1/5 of the members). Most of the standing committees meet monthly for about two hours. Students lack representation on 1/5 of the committees (administrators also

C. Committee Meetings (cont'd)

lack representation on about 1/5 of the committees). Students have equal representation to faculty or administration on about 1/2 of the committees, and they have a majority on about 1/4. The above data, therefore, make it obvious that students at the University of New Mexico do not have an equal voice to faculty and administrators on about 1/2 of the standing committees. This finding may lend support to the student complaint of "tokenism" which this researcher heard voiced several times in interviews with student leaders.

The question may legitimately be asked: Do students really want a voice on University Committees? One possible way to answer that question (besides surveying hundreds of students) is to tabulate the number of applications received by student government for the student seats on the standing committees. Table 13 presents the results of that tabulation. These figures do not include the number of applications from graduate students (most graduate students are appointed directly by the President of the Graduate Student Association).

Table 13

Number of Applications Received for Undergraduate Student Seats on Standing University Committees

Committee	No. Avail. Undergrad. Student Seats	**Number of Applications	*Number of Vacancies
Athletic Council	3	4	2
Campus Planning	1	2	0
Campus Safety	4	0	4
Continuing Education	1	1	1
Cultural Program	7	8	4
Curricula	1	3	1
Entrance and Credits	2	2	0
General Honors Council	1	1	1
Univ. Com. on Human Subjects	1	1	1
Intramural and Recreation	4	4	2
Library	1	2	0
National and Intl. Affairs	3	3	0
New Mexico Union Board	5***	8	1
New Student Orientation	4	6	3
Registration	2	3	0
Scholarships, Prizes, etc.	3	4	3
Speakers	7	19	3
Student Publications	4	6	0
Student Radio Board	4	5	0
Student Standards	4	12	0
Committee on the University	4	6	1
Total (21 committees)	66	100	27

*As of December 7, 1970 **As of December 1, 1970

***There are two additional undergraduate students on the Union Board, but they are appointed without applying (ASUNM President and 1 Senator).

C. Committee Meetings (cont'd)

The data in Table 13 indicate that there were 100 applications for 66 available undergraduate student seats on standing university committees. Twenty-one standing committees were included in the analysis above (six committees have no students, two have representation from student body presidents, one has just allowed student representation, and one is temporarily not meeting). Almost 1/3 of the student applications were for two committees (Speakers and Student Standards); therefore, most committees had approximately only one application for every available student seat (not exactly evidence of strong student desires to become involved on university standing committees). Another index of apparent student apathy toward committee openings are the 27 vacancies as of December 7, 1970. Again, it should be remembered that only recently was the Student Senate in a position to confirm student applications, and this may account for the vacancies. Another possibility is that students may perceive the committee seats as "tokenism."

The Linowitz Report mentioned that committees were a good place to increase communication between students and faculty members; however, it did warn that faculty members were beginning to become tired of all their committee assignments, which they found were taking time away from teaching and research activities. A contradiction is apparent: committees are formed and expanded to increase communication between students and faculty, usually at the expense of time reserved for office hours, informal communication, etc. between faculty and students. Committees, therefore, may be defeating the very purpose of their existence. This researcher did not gather data on the total number of committee hours per week engaged in by faculty members, but an example may be cited to illustrate the point. A professor in the College of Arts and Sciences may typically serve on one college committee, 2-3 departmental committees, one university standing committee and 2-3 sub-committees, simultaneously (in addition to attending departmental, college and university faculty meetings). The above example would reflect approximately 30 hours/month with committees and meetings (or about 7-8 hours/week).

Conclusions on Committee Meetings

1. Faculty compose a majority (52.4%) of the membership of the University of New Mexico's Standing Committees (followed by administrators - 26.4%, students - 20.6%, others - 0.6%).

2. Most of the standing committees meet monthly for about 2 hours.

3. Students lack representation on 1/5 of the committees; administrators also lack representation on about 1/5 of the committees.

4. Students have equal representation to faculty or administrators on about 1/2 of the committees; students have 50% or greater membership on about 1/4 of the committees.

5. Since students do not have an equal voice to faculty and administrators on about 1/2 of the standing committees, the student government complaint of "tokenism" may have some support.

6. Student interest in applying for committee seats is not high; only one application was submitted for every committee opening (except for two popular committees, Speakers and Standards); in addition, there were 27 vacancies on student seats as of December 7, 1970 (which may have been caused by the inert Student Senate).

7. Faculty members at this university may (as the Linowitz Report warned) be tired of committee assignments which detract time from teaching, office hours, student communication. (This conclusion is highly speculative and is only based on evidence obtained from interviewing several faculty members who serve on more than one committee.)

8. Overall Conclusion: Committee meetings as a channel of communication at the University of New Mexico may not be as effective as their intent. Students do not have an equal voice to faculty and administrators; student applications do not reflect high interest; about 40% of the student seats on committees are vacant; and faculty may be tired of the burden of committee assignments.

D. Student Curriculum Inputs (at College and Departmental Levels)

Evaluation of this channel will be done on the basis of three sources of information: independent surveys conducted by the University Governance Committee and the President of the Associated Student Body, and interviews this researchdr had with the Deans of the various Schools and Colleges. The results are presented by college or school.

1. College of Arts and Sciences

This is the largest degree-granting college at the University; there are 17 departments within the college, located in buildings spread out over the entire campus. At the college level the Dean has instituted a Student Advisory Board to provide him with feedback and advice on issues relevant to the college. One example of an activity of this committee has been to survey the students of the college on proposals for curriculum revision. Student participation in this committee has not exactly been encouraging: each department is invited to send one student representative to every meeting, but only 1/2 (8-9) of the departments have been regularly represented. Logistics make college-wide communication very difficult; the various departments are located in buildings distributed throughout the campus (some departments are located in 2-3 buildings). There is no central coffee lounge where students and faculty may meet informally; informal communication is left up to the individual student or faculty member.

The results of the Governance and Student Body surveys indicate: no department in the college has provision for formal voting rights for undergraduate students and only two departments allow graduate students to vote (Philosophy and Political Science) on matters of curriculum, etc.; eight departments have provision for formal (and four departments for informal) input from students on matters of curriculum and academic policy; all but three departments allow students to initiate classes (usually by petition to the chairman or the faculty); eight departments allow at least minimal student input on selection of reading materials for courses (usually done informally by contacting the instructor); all departments consider student needs in scheduling classes and most follow the criteria recommended by the registrar's office (avoid conflicts in time and space, student and faculty convenience, etc.); ten departments have held meetings in the past year to monitor student feedback (five additional departments had meetings with graduate students only); all departments indicated they thought such meetings might be effective. It is very difficult to generalize from the above information because of the diversity of the departments. A small department like Journalism, for example, with only four full-time faculty members and approximately sixty majors, may not need formal procedures to engage in active communication among its members; informal communication may accomplish the goal of getting student input.

1. College of Arts and Sciences (cont'd)

It is possible, however, to make a few statements on the basis of the above information:

1. Logistics make communication within the College of Arts and Sciences very difficult.
2. The Student Advisory Board, which is intended to provide the Dean with feedback and advice, may not be providing information representative of the students in all departments; only 1/2 of the 17 departments have been regularly sending student representatives to the meetings.
3. No department in the college provides voting rights for undergraduate and graduate students (two departments allow graduate student representatives to vote) and few departments have formal procedures for student involvement in departmental policy-making.

2. College of Education

The College of Education has 7 departments which are located in the Education Complex, a major building (for administration) and four wings (classrooms, offices, etc.) plus five nearby buildings. At the college level students have representation with voting rights on the three major college committees: college policy (one undergraduate and one graduate); undergraduate curriculum (two undergraduates); and graduate curriculum (two graduate students). There is one coffee lounge located in the faculty office wing and it is frequented most often by graduate assistants (and faculty); undergraduates seldom frequent this lounge.

The responses to the Governance and Student Body surveys indicate: no department allows undergraduates to vote at faculty meetings, but three provide voting rights for graduate students; five departments have provision for formal student input on curriculum matters; all departments allow students to initiate a class (by contacting the chairman or a faculty member); five departments provide either formal or informal channels for student input on reading assignments; all departments consider faculty and student needs in scheduling classes (besides following the registrar's criteria); three departments schedule formal faculty-student meetings, and three departments indicated a more informal method of soliciting student feedback. The following statements summarize this data:

1. Logistics appear to be favorable for communication (with the proximity of all buildings in the College of Education to each other; in addition, there is a coffee lounge in the building which should create an environment for informal communication. However, the isolation of the faculty offices in a separate wing of the complex (which is difficult to reach) may not allow faculty to be accessible to students; moreover, the coffee lounge is not frequented by undergraduate students.
2. At the college level, undergraduate and graduate students have full voting rights on the three major college committees.

2. College of Education (cont'd)
   3. No department allows undergraduate student voting, three provide for graduate student voting, and five have formal curriculum inputs for all students.

3. College of Fine Arts

The College of Fine Arts has four departments, located in several buildings around campus, with its main offices in the new Fine Arts Building. Student members with the right to vote are included on all college committees except the College Personnel Committee. Student representation on these committees is not limited to one or two students; four students (and usually four faculty members) serve on most committees. (These provisions are written into the Constitution of the College of Fine Arts.)

All of the departments schedule regular meetings with their students; for example, the Department of Dramatic Art meets weekly with its students to solicit feedback on curriculum, grievances, etc. Since there are only four departments in the college, matters of curricula and courses are decided by the formal college committees, where students have full voting rights. On the basis of the above information it appears that:

1. The College of Fine Arts has a problem of space and logistics, which may impede informal communication.
2. The College of Fine Arts provides its students with full voting rights (on all committees but College Personnel, which considers matters of faculty promotion, tenure, etc.). Student representation is apparently not "tokenism"; equal numbers of students and faculty compose most committees.
3. The four departments in the college schedule regular meetings with their students to monitor feedback and seek advice; decisions based on this feedback are made by the college committees.

4. College of Engineering

The College of Engineering has five departments which are all located centrally in the Engineering Complex, a series of buildings surrounding a new Engineering Center (which houses administrative offices). There is a grassy mall in the center of several of the buildings and a coffee lounge in most departments. "Most departments have not felt the need for any formal procedures for soliciting student opinion. The Mechanical Engineering Department appears as an exception." (according to a University Governance Committee Report). The Mechanical Engineering Department allows three student "observers" to attend meetings of the curriculum committee; they do not have voting rights. Informal communication in the coffee lounges appears to be excellent (according to the Dean, several faculty and students interviewed by this researcher, and my own observations on seven occasions), and this may be the reason that most of the

4. College of Engineering (cont'd)

departments do not feel they need formal communication channels. The Dean maintains an open-door policy and sees approximately 3-4 students each day via this channel (as compared with 3/week for the President and six Vice-Presidents of the University). Two conclusions are apparent for this college:

1. Informal channels of communication appear to be working quite well in the College of Engineering (coffee lounge, open-door, etc.). Logistics may make this possible.
2. Only one of the five departments (Mechanical Engineering) has formal student input at its curriculum meetings (without voting rights), but informal channels seem to negate the need for more formal channels (according to student and faculty reports).

5. School of Business and Administrative Sciences

The School of Business and Administrative Sciences is not departmentalized. It is located in one building (with two wings) near the center of campus. There is a coffee lounge on the second floor of the classroom wing where students and faculty frequently mingle together in an informal setting. The organizational structure of the School embraces three program teams and a planning committee (each with two student representatives, with full voting rights). Students plan programs, initiate classes and are involved in academic policy decisions as members of the above teams. Students and faculty meet throughout the year (coffees, symposiums, professional meetings, etc.). Briefly, the following may be said about this School:

1. Informal channels of communication, because of favorable logistics (coffee lounge, one building), appear to be open and working adequately (according to student and faculty reports, as well as that of the Dean).
2. Students have complete curriculum input (with full voting rights) by membership on the School's three program teams and the Planning Committee.

6. School of Law

The School of Law is currently located in one building near the center of campus; it is moving into a new building near the Medical School next fall. The School has about 200 students and fifteen faculty; (according to the Dean) "all students seek to be lawyers; there are no majors; the students have a compact student organization, the Student Bar Association. So communication is easier, and problems are less varied. The Dean can talk with all of the students in a group rather than to a select few; all of the students can have a voice in decisions--for example on schedules or curriculum . . . As a result,

6. School of Law (cont'd)

the law school is more informal, and it is easier to engage the student body in discussions." Curriculum decisions in the School, however, are also dictated by the requirements of the State Bar, ethical problems, the client, etc. "Two students serve (ex officio) on the Curriculum Committee; open meetings are occasionally held with faculty and students to discuss curriculum. The dean meets with small groups, and with the entire student body to discuss curriculum needs. The proposed list of courses for the next semester is posted on a bulletin board and all students are invited to make comments and suggestions. Many curriculum changes have resulted over the past four years as a result of student request; the Clinical Program inaugurated this year was a student-sponsored movement." The above comments by the Dean were verified by the President of the Student Bar Association and the Editor-in-Chief of the Natural Resources Journal. They added ". . . one practice at the law school probably aids communication more than any other: that is the practice of grading tests on an anonymous basis--when a law professor grades finals, he does not know the identity of the student who wrote the test. The result is that students feel little necessity to "brown nose" . . . any professor and are more apt to be outspoken about alleged problems from which the school suffers . . . most (but not all) of the professors make a conscious effort to make students feel welcome to discuss problems--personal or otherwise--at any reasonable time . . . there is some feeling here that the students have partial influence on the manner in which problems are handled . . . an air of informality pervades the law school such that students are generally cognizant of what goes on. It is not the least uncommon for the Dean or a faculty member to discuss problems of any nature (even the most sensitive) with one or more students. . . . In sum, the communication is not perfect, but it is good." On the basis of the above comments by the Dean and the two student leaders:

1. Logistics (number of students, space) make informal communication possible at the Law School.
2. All students are invited to comment on the curriculum (via open meetings, talks with the Dean or faculty), and two students (ex officio members) sit on the School's Curriculum Committee.
3. The bulletin board is used to communicate rapidly matters of academic interest to the students (class schedules, tentative courses, etc.).
4. The Dean and the faculty's attitudes seem to encourage open communication among all parties in the School.

7. School of Medicine

The School of Medicine is located in one building isolated from the central campus (near a hospital). There are currently about 130 students in the School, each with his own mailbox in the building. The professional goal (according to the Dean)

7. School of Medicine (cont'd)

appears to aid in the establishment of a "feeling of community" among the students and faculty. The faculty typically work from 8-5 each day and thus are in a good position to interact constantly with students in small group situations (lab, hospital, etc.). Although only 47% of the faculty were found to be "available" during the office hours survey (see above), student and faculty interviews suggest otherwise; i.e., the faculty are available constantly in labs, etc. and work closely with students, mostly on a one-to-one basis. "The Medical School involves students as voting members of almost every committee on curriculum, promotions, etc., and as non-voting members of the Dean's Advisory Committee" (according to the chairman of Biochemistry). Briefly, then,:

1. Student input exists (with full voting rights) on most of the committees of the Medical School.
2. Students and faculty work together constantly in professional settings (labs, hospital), often on a one-to-one basis, which allows for an open flow of communication between the two.

8. College of Nursing

The College of Nursing is located in one building, also isolated from the central campus. Two students currently serve on the Curriculum Steering Committee and plans have been formulated to include student representatives on all college committees. A committee of students meets regularly and presents curriculum suggestions directly to the Dean. No further comments are made at this time because the program is undergoing revision (which will allow for greater student input).

9. College of Pharmacy

The College of Pharmacy is located in one building where approximately 135 students are enrolled in a common core curriculum (in addition to electives). Equal numbers of students and faculty serve on a Student-Faculty Committee and two students (with full voting rights) serve on the Curriculum Committee, which meets weekly for about one hour. Students may initiate classes by working through one of the above committees.

Overall Conclusion for Curriculum Input Channel

It is difficult to generalize about the entire University, because of the diversity of the Colleges and Schools, however, one pattern is apparent: all of the Schools and Colleges but two (Engineering and Arts and Sciences) have provisions for formal student inputs (usually with full voting rights--except in the Law School) on matters of curriculum, scheduling or initiating classes and other matters of academic policy; in the College of Arts and Sciences, there is no formal college-wide Curriculum Committee (the Dean maintains a Student Advisory Board which advises

him on many matters, one of which may be curriculum), but eight departments have formal channels (two with student voting members) and four departments have informal channels for such purposes; in the College of Engineering informal channels of communication seem to negate the need for more formal channels (according to student and faculty reports).

E. General Faculty Meeting

Twelve undergraduate and three graduate students are allowed to attend the monthly meetings of the general faculty. According to the secretary in the student government office (who prepares a list of the names of those students wishing to attend and sends it to the secretary of the faculty), only 2-3 students have been attending the meetings. The one exception this year was a special faculty meeting called to discuss the feasibility of establishing a faculty senate--13 students attended that meeting. It is apparent that this channel is not too operative as it exists now (students may speak at meetings but may not vote); students are not regularly attending faculty meetings.

F. Advisement System and Counseling Center

Any evaluation of this channel would be repetitious of the document prepared by Huber et al. (May 4, 1970) and submitted to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. The present advisement system at the University is about to undergo substantial changes (pre-registration, summer orientation, etc.) making any present statements almost immediately obsolete.

G. AMISTAD - The Free University

AMISTAD began the 1970-71 academic year with a listing of 27 courses in its catalogue; most courses (according to 19 instructors whom this researcher contacted by telephone) were averaging 10-15 students (three had 20-25 students). As of November 25, 1970, 24 instructors were listed with the AMISTAD office as still offering courses; telephone conversations with 19 of those instructors revealed that only nine were still offering courses which were attracting students (some instructors were still holding meetings but no students were coming); of those nine instructors who were still attracting students, the average number of students per class was 3-5. It is apparent that AMISTAD is not now an effective channel of communication between students and faculty. Possible reasons for the apparent failure of AMISTAD (as indicated by the instructors contacted on the telephone) are: schedule conflicts, logistics (classes keep changing location), poor communication between AMISTAD and the student body, and a lack of student time to attend regular classes and AMISTAD.

III. Recommendations

A. In the area of instructional communication:

1. A mandatory system of instructor evaluation based on student, faculty and administration inputs should be immediately instituted at UNM. Such a system should serve: student needs for better instruction; faculty needs for immediate feedback; and administration needs for valid faculty advancement decisions. The word system allows for first-hand multiple inputs (such as observation by faculty and administrators, student questionnaires and interviews, self-evaluation, video or audio recordings of classes, inspection of syllabi, outlines, textbooks and other materials developed for use in a course, etc.). Multiple inputs could serve to cross-validate each other, thus eliminating the argument that the evaluation lacks validity; in addition, advice could be sought from institutions with such evaluation systems already in operation (University of California at Davis, Princeton, Purdue, University of Washington, Syracuse, Carnegie-Mellon University, etc., etc.). The systems approach could be flexible enough for adaptation to the individual department or school, and need not be uniformly administered across the entire university. Such a system would allow students the opportunity to provide immediate feedback to instructors, faculty would gain valuable knowledge to help them improve their instruction, and lastly, the administration would have first-hand knowledge upon which to base their faculty advancement decisions. Such knowledge would obviously be more valid and reliable than the currently employed system of "academic gossip."
2. The use of closed circuit TV to supplement existing course structures should be expanded at UNM. Multi-media approaches should be investigated.
3. The lecture method should be replaced wherever possible with discussion-seminar approaches in order to increase teacher-student interaction, so vital to the process of human communication.
4. Graduate students who teach course sections should undergo extensive and continuous training in the technology of teaching; departmental seminars could be offered in the "Teaching of _____." (It is the personal feeling of this researcher that graduate teaching assistants should be reserved for assisting professors in upper-level courses, and professors should be exposed to lower-division courses, thus reversing the present trend in higher education.

B. UNM Faculty members (especially those at the ranks of Assistant and full Professor) should re-examine their commitment to maintaining office hours. Perhaps office hours should be held in less formal settings than professors' offices (such as the Union, a professor or student's home, etc.)

III. Recommendations (continued)

C. The entire committee structure at UNM should be re-examined. Where too many committees are creating inefficient operation and taking up faculty members' time (which could be used in office hours, preparation for teaching, research), consolidation and elimination should be considered. Where students do not have a significant voice on university committees, they should be given appropriate input (at least in the form of ex officio seats).

D. The examples of the College of Fine Arts (for significant formal student input), of the College of Engineering (for efficient informal channels), and of the Schools of Law and Business and Administrative Sciences (for a combination of efficient formal and informal channels) should be followed or continued in establishing channels of communication for student curriculum inputs.

E. Departments (or Colleges and Schools) should schedule (or continue scheduling) frequent and regular meetings of their majors and minors to monitor feedback on matters of academic policy. These meetings should include significant round-table discussions (in small groups of students and faculty). These meetings could be scheduled in the form of weekend retreats, one-day motel conferences, or 2-3 hour gatherings in a meeting room or home. The faculty should follow-up these meetings with decision-making discussions of their own and provide immediate feedback to the students (with substantiated reasons) for adopting or not adopting various suggestions from these meetings.

F. The office of University Ombudsman should be established (see student-administration recommendations). In addition, individual departments, schools or colleges should consider establishing their own ombudsman to consider grievances of a local nature. This may relieve the campus ombudsman of many impositions on his time, thus freeing him to act on matters of importance to the entire university.

G. In the area of informal communication:
   1. Dormitories and Fraternities should establish faculty guest programs, whereby interested faculty members (and their wives) would eat regularly at assigned dorms, for example, and attend some of their social functions. One possible example to follow could be the Purdue Faculty Fellows Program which assigns faculty and administrators to dorms as "honorary members" with full dining privileges.
   2. The above recommendation could be expanded to allow interested faculty members to move into the dorm or fraternity for one or two semesters. This system may favor younger, single faculty members, but should not exclude interested married faculty. (Professors could even offer their classes in the dorm.) A system such as that operating at the University of Massachusetts could be studied for consideration.

III. Recommendations (cont'd)

G. 3. To reduce the threat of organization role relationships (common to any organization with a hierarchy) wherever possible (by joint consent of involved faculty and students), first-names should be encouraged in all interactions. The faculty should take the initiative in this effort, remembering that student respect is not necessarily earned as much by academic titles as by demonstrating competence in the area of expertise, effective teaching methods and the ability to motivate students to self-instruction.

4. Colleges which are located in many buildings scattered over the campus should establish multiple coffee lounges (if necessary, sidewalk cafes or mini-student-unions) in strategic locations to encourage informal communication between faculty and students.

5. The design of new buildings should consider such logistical questions as accessibility of faculty offices, placement of lounge areas in strategic locations, etc. so as to encourage multiple intereaction between students and faculty.

H. Finally, all of the above recommendations assume that students want improved faculty-student communication at UNM. A scientific polling of the UNM student body should be conducted to provide data on student opinions, desires and suggestions in this area. Until this is done, we are forced to rely upon such indexes of student interest as:

1. AMISTAD's average attendance per class (as of November 25, 1970) was 3-5 students.
2. An average of only 4-5 students/week were visiting twenty professors who regularly maintained their office hours.
3. Attendance at the College of Arts and Sciences' Student Advisory Board meetings has been averaging 50%.
4. Only one application per university committee opening (on the average) was received by student government (except for two popular committees); as of December 7, 1970 there were still 27 vacancies.
5. Less than 50% of the University College students picked up their mid-term grades from their advisors (in the 1969-70 academic year)--an obvious channel of communication between students and faculty.
6. Only 2-3 undergraduate students have been regularly attending faculty meetings (provision for 12 undergraduates is maintained by the faculty).
7. Only 10 undergraduate students (out of a possible 20 openings) applied for a student seat at the University Governance Conference at the Holiday Inn. Fifteen students (out of a possible 42 seats) did not even show up for the conference.
8. Only three graduate students (out of more than 100) responded to one department's pleas for curriculum suggestions.
9. One instructor invited all his freshmen students (more than 90 students) to his home for an open house--only 17 showed up.

III. Recommendations (cont'd)

H. The above information could no doubt be offset by more encouraging statistics from different sources of activity, however, there is a distinct pattern of lack of student interest which must be verified by scientific means before investments of time and money are forthcoming from faculty members interested in implementing any of the above recommendations.

- -

REFERENCES

Astin, W. W. "Classroom Environments in Different Fields of Study," Journal of Educational Psychology, 56: 275-82, October, 1965.

Berlo, David. The Process of Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Bettelheim, Bruno. "The Anatomy of Academic Dissent," Change, pp. 18-26, May-June, 1969.

College and University Business. "The Brave New University and Its Administration," 45: 59-62, August, 1968.

Dedmon, Donald N. "A Comparison of University and Business Communication Practices," Journal of Communication, 20: 315-22, September, 1970.

Eble, Kenneth E. The Recognition and Evaluation of Teaching. Salt Lake City: Project to Improve College Teaching, 1970.

Farnsworth, Dana. "Student Rootlessness and Restlessness," Unpublished Manuscript (Delivered to Illinois Conference on Higher Education), November, 1965.

For Your Information. Washington, D.C.: Office of Institutional Research, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, September 18, 1970.

Gray, Glenn J. "Individuality Versus Individualism," Unpublished Manuscript (Delivered to Illinois Conference on Higher Education), November, 1965.

Heady, Ferrel. "The Role of the President Today," Public Administration Review, 30: 117-122, March/April, 1970.

Huber, William. The Invisible Student. Albuquerque: University College and Counseling Center, May, 1969.

_____. "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Advisement," Unpublished Manuscript, May 4, 1970.

Jencks, Christopher, "A New Breed of BA's," New Republic, pp. 17-21, October 23, 1965.

Katz, Joseph and Nevitt Sanford. "The New Student Power and Needed Educational Reforms," Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 397-401, April, 1966.

Keene, C. Mansel. "Administration of System-Wide Faculty and Staff Affairs," Public Administration Review, 30: 53-68, March/April, 1970.

Klapper, P. "The Professional Preparation of the College Teacher," Journal of General Education, 3: 228-44, April, 1949.

Langen, T.D. "Student Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness," Improving College and University Teaching, 14: 22-25, Winter, 1966.

Linowitz, Sol M. Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations. Washington, D.C.: American Council of Education, 1970.

Lipscomb, Greg. "Some Concepts of Student Academic Freedom," Unpublished Manuscript (Delivered at the Convention of the American Council of Education, October, 1965).

Muston, Ray A. "Governance Changes Are Catching Colleges by Surprise, National Survey Shows," College and University Business, pp. 29-33, July, 1969.

"Princeton Report on Student Evaluation," in Eble, Kenneth E. The Recognition and Evaluation of Teaching. Salt Lake City: Project to Improve College Teaching, 1970, pp. 50-61.

Robertson, James H. "Academic Advising in Colleges and Universities --Its Present State and Present Problems," The North Central Association Quarterly, pp. 228-39, 1962.

Scranton, William. "Text of the Findings of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest," The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 5, 1970.

"University of California at Berkely Report of the Select Committee on Education," Berkely: U.C. Regents, 1966.

"University of California at Davis Report on Effective University Teaching and Its Evaluation," in Eble, Kenneth E. The Recognition and Evaluation of Teaching. Salt Lake City: Project to Improve College Teaching, 1970, pp. 90-100.

Williamson, E. G. and John L. Cowan. "Students and Academic Freedom," The Intercollegian, Orientation, 1966, pp. 13-16.

Wingfield, Clyde J. "Campus Conflict and Institutional Maintenance," Public Administration Review, 30: 3-18, March/April, 1970.